

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

JULY, 1858.

ART. I. — THE CHURCH OF ROME IN HER THEOLOGY.

1. *Il Sacro Concilio di Trento, con le Notizie più precise risguardanti la sua Intimazione a ciascuna delle Sessioni. Nuova Traduzione Italiana col Testo Latino a fronte.* Venezia, 1822. Appresso gli Eredi Baglioni stamp. ed edit. Vol. I.
2. *Œuvres de BOSSUET. Tome Quatrième. Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, etc.* Paris : chez Firmin Didot Frères. MDCCCLII.
3. *Catechismus ex Decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos, Pii V. Pont. Max. Jussu editus.* Romæ ex Typographia Coll. Urb. de Prop. Fide Superiorum Permissu. 1839. Vols. II.
4. *Istoria del Concilio di Trento scritta dal PADRE SFORZA PALLAVICINO della Compagnia di Gesù, etc. Ora Illustrata con Annotazioni da FRANCESCO ANTONIA ZACCARIA.* Roma, 1833. Nel Collegio Urbano di Propaganda Fide. Vols. IV.

WE propose, on the showing of the works above named, to present an outline of the leading doctrines of the Church of Rome. The diametrical completeness of the antithesis which divides the theory of that Church from the one represented in this journal, gives to its doctrinal confession an importance which belongs to no intermediate communion. There are at bottom, in all the churches of Christendom, but two fundamental principles of polity and faith,—the principle of authority, and that of freedom. And if once the principle of

authority is adopted as the basis of a church, we can see, in the application of that principle, no just and intelligible limit short of the Church of Rome. If any one shall say that the Bible is that limit, we answer that the Bible is common to all the churches, and professedly a rule of faith to all. The question is, whether, in the interpretation of that rule, ecclesiastical authority or reason shall decide. If we say authority, then the Church of Rome has the strongest claim to legitimacy; if reason, then is that the most legitimate church which allows the greatest liberty of individual judgment.

While, therefore, the so-called orthodox churches are based on human authority and creeds, and while all have abandoned the salient doctrine of the Reformers concerning Justification by Faith, and, whether they know it or not, have all gone back to the dogma of Faith as settled by the Council of Trent, the battle between the old and the new, between tradition and reason, between spiritual slavery and spiritual freedom, between stagnation and progress, must be fought, on the side of progress, by those who, rejecting the authority of all ecclesiastical creeds, insist on the primary facts of revelation and the human mind.

Most liberal Christians, it is to be hoped, can give a reason for the faith that is in *them*, but few have any exact knowledge of the doctrines of that Church which, through her servants, whispers seductively into the ear of a monarch, or mingles in a popular election, in order to compass her end of universal mental despotism.

We desire to be just, and we say at the outset, with a candid Protestant divine: * "The religion of the Roman Catholics ought always, in strictness, to be considered apart from its professors, whether kings, popes, or superior bishops; and its tenets and its forms should be treated of separately. To the acknowledged creeds, catechisms, and other formularies of the Catholic Church, we should resort for a faithful description of what Roman Catholics do really hold, as doctrines essential to salvation; and, as such, held by the faithful in all times, places, and countries. Though the Catholic *forms*

* The Religions of all Nations, by the Rev. J. Nightingale, p. 12.

in some points may vary in number and splendor, the Catholic *doctrines* cannot; though *opinions* may differ, and change with circumstances, *articles of faith* remain the same. Without a due and constant consideration of these facts, no Protestant can come to a right understanding respecting the essential faith and worship of Roman Catholics. It has been owing to a want of this discrimination, that so many absurd, and even wicked tenets, have been imputed to our brethren of the Catholic Church. That which they deny, we have insisted that they rigorously hold; that which the best informed amongst them utterly abhor, we have held up to the detestation of mankind, as the guide of their faith and the rule of their actions. This is not fair; it is not doing unto others as we would have others do unto us."

In our summary of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, we shall be principally guided by the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Whether its composition was commenced before the breaking up of the Council, is a question not likely to be settled, even by the Catholics themselves;* yet it is everywhere regarded by the faithful as a true exposition of the doctrines of "holy mother Church," as settled by the fathers of that celebrated assembly. We learn from Tiraboschi† and Lagomarsini‡ that it was composed by four learned men, three of whom were bishops, under the superintendence of the Archbishop of Milan. The work, when completed, was delivered to Pius V., who delivered it to a congregation presided over by Cardinal Sirlet for revision. Paulus Manutius, or, according to Lagomarsini, Pogianus himself, retouched it, in order to perfect its latinity. The vigilant and tireless Manutius superintended the press. The Catechism was published by the authority of the Pontiff; and, by his command, translated into Italian, French, German, and Polish. We are not aware of any English translation, except the very faithful one of Dr. Donovan, dated Maynooth College, June 10, 1829. The

* Pallavicino, Lib. XXXIV. cap. 13.

† Storia della Letteratura Italiana, Tom. VII. Part. I., pp. 304-308. Romæ, MDCLXXXIV.

‡ Epistolæ et Orationes Julii Pogiani, editæ a Lagomarsini, (Romæ, 1756,) Vol. II. p. xx.

fathers of Trent, in anticipation, ordered that the Catechism should everywhere be translated into the vernacular.*

The decisions of the Council of Trent are regarded by all good Catholics as final. Zaccaria says, in a note to Pallavicino, that "Bossuet, in combating the errors and innovations of the Protestants, proposed to himself no other guide than the Council of Trent; nor should he have done otherwise, since it was the Church that spoke through the Council to the faithful."† "Its merits," says Dr. Donovan, in the preface to his translation of the Catechism, "were then, as they are now, recognized by the Universal Church; and the place given amongst the masters of spiritual life to the devout A Kempis, 'second only,' says Fonténelle, 'to the books of canonical Scripture,' has been unanimously awarded to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as a compendium of Catholic theology."‡

Human reason is insufficient, therefore revelation is necessary. There is also required, for the explanation of the Word of God, a class of men set apart and consecrated to the ministry of divine things. The succession of teachers from Jesus Christ is unbroken. The words of the pastors of the Church must then be received as the teachings of God. That we may know Christ and him crucified, that we may keep his commandments and fulfil the law, are the especial objects to be kept in view by the divinely appointed teachers.

But where is found the Word of God? It is found in Scripture and tradition, — in the revelation first made to man, and in the accumulated teachings of the divinely appointed ministers of Christ.§ What, then, are the doctrines contained in this double Word of God? Here we have them in the Catechism, carefully stated by half a dozen learned ecclesiastics, carefully guarded by the charitable fathers of Trent with their *anathema sit*. They are all summed up

* "Juxta formam a Sancta Synodo in Catechesi singulis Sacramentis præscribendum; quam Episcopi in vulgarem linguam fideliter verti, atque a parochis omnibus populo exponi curabunt." — Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIX. Can. VII.

† Pallavicino, Vol. IV. p. 735.

‡ Preface, p. viii.

§ "Omnis autem doctrinæ ratio, quæ, fidelibus tradenda sit, Verbo Dei continetur, quod in scripturam traditionesque distributum est." — Catech. Rom., Præf. 12.

under the four heads of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. Nothing, at first sight, very formidable in this. It is not the Creed, however, that is presented for our belief, but a *doctrine* of the Creed, which "contains all that is to be held according to the discipline of the Christian faith, whether it regards the knowledge of God, the creation and government of the world, or the redemption of man, the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked."* Neither is it the Seven Sacraments that we are to receive, according to our own interpretation of them, but a *doctrine* of the Sacraments, comprehending the signs, and, as it were, the *instruments* of grace.

Every Christian sect accepts, in its own way, the apostolic "symbol" of faith. The Catholic Church, and all "orthodox" sects among Protestants, agree in regarding the *unity of the Divine essence*, and the *distinction of three persons*, as a fundamental doctrine in the interpretation of the creed. They virtually divide it into three principal parts; (1.) one describing the first person of the Divine nature and the work of creation; (2.) another, the second person and the mystery of man's redemption; (3.) a third comprising the doctrine of the third person,—the origin and source of man's sanctification. The doctrine of "the blessed and adorable Trinity," then, is the root of all *orthodox* confessions of faith, whether Catholic or Protestant. It is not sufficient to say, "*I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth,*" but we must add, *Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity*. In the Catholic Catechism, the word Father is made the generator of a doctrine of plurality of persons,—"a mysterious truth, which human reason and research not only could not reach, but even conjecture to exist."† In the same breath it declares that "it would be impiety to assert that the three persons are unlike or unequal in anything";‡ that "unity belongs to the essence, and *distinction* to the *persons*."§ No wonder that "curiosity

* Catech. Rom., Præf. 12.

† "Quodque humana ratio et intelligentia non consequi, aut ne suspicari quidem poterat."—Catech. Rom., Pars I cap. ii. 10.

‡ "Cum in iis quidquam dissimile aut dispar cogitare nefas sit."—Idem.

§ "Et sciunt fideles unitatem esse in essentia, distinctionem autem in personis."—Idem.

is to be avoided in examining this the most profound and difficult of mysteries," when we are gravely told that "the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty; and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty," the "Father being *particularly* called Almighty, because he is the *source of all origin!*"*

We have, too, of course, the old story of the rebellious angels and the making a world out of nothing, in the exposition of the phrase, "*Maker of heaven and earth.*" Not only has God made all things, visible and invisible, out of nothing, but he constantly sustains them with his divine energy, or they would collapse into their original nonentity. To crown all, the creation is the glorious work of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. To support these dogmas, plenty of texts are cited from sacred Scripture and the Fathers. We cannot help saying, with Bassanio:—

" In religion,
What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament? "

An exposition of the second article gives us the doctrine of man's fall, and the way of redemption by the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Original sin and its punishment, says the Catechism,† were not confined to Adam, but have justly descended from him, as their source and cause, to all his posterity. The human race having thus fallen from their pre-eminent dignity, no power of men or angels could by any means lift them from their fallen condition, and replace them in their primitive state. To remedy the evil, and repair the loss, it remained that the Son of God, whose power is infinite, having assumed the weakness of our flesh, should remove the infinite weight of sin, and reconcile us to God in his blood. This doctrine is not contained in the "And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord" of the Apostles' Creed, nor in the corresponding part of the intensely Trinitarian Nicene Creed,— "And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, true

* "Quia omnis originis fons est." — Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. ii. 14.

† Idem, cap. iii. 3.

God of true God, begotten not made, consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made." Yet, in the exposition of the creed, it is very clearly and unequivocally stated.*

This article of faith is regarded alike by Catholics and orthodox Protestant sects as necessary to salvation. "The belief and profession of this our redemption," say the authors of the Catechism of Trent, "which God held out in the beginning, are now, and always were, necessary to salvation."

And orthodox Protestants at the *present* time agree with the Catholics as to the import of this doctrine. The salient doctrine of the Reformers, as we remarked in the beginning of this article, has, either consciously or unconsciously, been abandoned, and that of the Council of Trent has been virtually adopted in its stead. We have in vain sought a statement or recognition of this important fact in all the histories of the Reformation on which we could lay our hands. The sagacious and erudite Sir William Hamilton, so far as we are aware, has alone noticed this cardinal variation in Protestantism:—"*Assurance*, Personal Assurance, Special Faith, (*the feeling of certainty*, that God is propitious to *me*,—that *my* sins are forgiven, *Fiducia*, *Plerophoria Fidei*, *Fides Specialis*,)—Assurance was long universally held in the Protestant communities to be the criterion and condition of a true or *Saving Faith*. Luther declares, that 'he who hath not Assurance spews faith out'; and Melancthon, that 'Assurance is the discriminating line of Christianity from Heathenism.' Assurance is, indeed, the *punctum saliens* of Luther's system; and an acquaintance with this, his great central doctrine, is one prime cause of the chronic misrepresentation which runs through our recent histories of Luther and the Reformation. Assurance is no less strenuously maintained by Calvin; is held even by Arminius; and stands, essentially, part and parcel of all the confessions of all the churches of the Reformation, down to the Westminster Assembly. In that synod, *Assurance* was, in Protestantism for the *first*—and indeed the *only*—time, formally declared '*not to be of the essence of Faith*'; and accordingly, the Scottish General Assembly has subse-

* Conc. Trid., Sess. VI. Can. II. De dispensatione, et mysterio adventus Christi.

quently once and again condemned and deposed the holders of this, the doctrine of Luther, of Calvin, of all the other churches of the Reformation, and of the older Scottish Church itself. In the English, and, more articulately, in the Irish Establishment, Assurance still stands a necessary tenet of ecclesiastical belief. (See *Homilies*, Book I. Number iii. Part 3, specially referred to in the eleventh of *Thirty-nine Articles*, and Number iv. Part 1 and 3; likewise the sixth *Lambeth Article*.) Assurance was consequently held by all the older Anglican Churchmen, of whom Hooker may stand for the example: but Assurance is now openly disavowed, without scruple, by Anglican Churchmen, high and low, when apprehended; but of these, many, like Mr. Hare [the archdeacon], are blissfully incognizant of the opinion, its import, its history, and even its name."

What Hamilton says of the Anglican Church, is true of the corresponding Church in this country. Among the Presbyterians and other Calvinistic, or semi-Calvinistic, churches of America, the doctrine has not been explicitly and formally rejected, for the double reason that it has never here been held by them as an article of faith, and for the most part, or, if we except Jonathan Edwards, President Hopkins, Dr. Hitchcock, and perhaps one or two more, wholly unknown or misunderstood. The Methodists ignore it, or, rather, are completely ignorant of it; although, like Spurgeon, they practically adopt it in revival preaching, thereby making unconscious *self-sufficient* Christian converts.

"This dogma," continues Hamilton,* "with its fortune, past and present, affords indeed a series of the most *curious contrasts*. For it is curious that this cardinal point of Luther's doctrine should, without exception, have been constituted into the fundamental principle of all the churches of the Reformation, and, as their common and uncatholic doctrine, have been condemned at Trent.† Again, it is curious that this common

* *Discussions on Philosophy, etc.*, by Sir William Hamilton, (London, Longmans,) pp. 508, 509.

† Whoever will take the pains to look up the twenty-three canons adopted at its sixth session by the Council of Trent, and compare them with the Augsburg and other Protestant confessions, will see how exact Hamilton is in this statement. The

and differential doctrine of the churches of the Reformation should now be abandoned virtually in, or formally by, all these churches themselves. Again, it is curious that Protestants should now generally profess the counter doctrine, asserted at Trent in condemnation of their peculiar principle. Again, it is curious that this the most important *variation* in the faith of Protestants, or, in fact, a gravitation of Protestantism back towards Catholicity, should have been overlooked — or indeed in his day undeveloped — by the keen-eyed author of ‘The History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.’* Finally, it is curious that, though now fully developed, this central approximation of Protestantism to Catholicity should not, as far as I know, have been signalized by any theologian, Protestant or Catholic; whilst the Protestant symbol (*Fides sola justificat*, Faith alone justifies), though now eviscerated of its real import, and now only manifesting an unimportant difference of expression, is still supposed to mark the discrimination of the two religious denominations. For both agree that the three heavenly virtues must *all* concur to salvation; and they only differ, whether Faith, *as a word*, does or does not involve Hope and Charity. This misprision would have been avoided had Luther and Calvin only said, *Fiducia sola justificat*, Assurance alone justifies; for by their doctrine Assurance was convertible with true Faith, and true Faith implied the other Christian graces. But this primary and peculiar doctrine of the Reformation is now harmoniously condemned by Catholics and Protestants in unison.”

As liberal Christians, then, we stand arrayed against all other sects upon this cardinal doctrine. For us, too, Christ is the divinely appointed *Teacher*, the messenger of God’s

following is the twelfth canon : — “ Si quis dixerit fidem justificantem nihil aliud esse, quam *fiduciam divine misericordie*, peccata remittentis propter Christum, vel *eam fiduciam solam* esse, qua justificamur; anathema sit.” — Conc. Trid., Sess. VI. Can. XII.

* Hamilton truly says “keen-eyed.” It is one of the most pitiable sights in this universe to see Bossuet, taking the premises given him by the Council of Trent, building upon a foundation of sand a splendid edifice of erudition, controversial honesty, and critical ability. His whole argument is this: Catholicism is true, Protestantism differs from it, and therefore is false. Aside from his creed, the “Eagle of Meaux” was generous and candid; but after having sacrificed his reason to that, what else would he not sacrifice?

love, to reconcile us to the Father Almighty, not to propitiate the Justice otherwise implacable to fallen and helpless humanity. With the Catholic Council of Constantinople, we acknowledge the Christ, "who *for us men, and for our salvation*, became incarnate and was made man."* If we cannot say with the Fathers of Trent that he was "at the same time perfect God and perfect man," yet we believe that "God was *in Christ* reconciling the world to *himself*." With the faithful children of the Church, we glory that "the *Son* of God is bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh," and 'would so live that, as he was denied a dwelling in the place of his nativity on earth, he be not denied a dwelling in our quickened hearts. We believe with all Christendom that "he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried"; but when Catholics profess that, "while his soul was separated from his body, his divinity continued always united, both to his body in the sepulchre and to his soul in limbo," we do not pretend to understand what they mean. Their explanation that *God was buried*, or *God* was born of a virgin, or *God* died on the cross, does not at all help our inability to comprehend such mysteries. We do not pretend to fathom the intimate sufferings of the Redeemer on the cross; but, touched with his spirit, we know that it is even good to thus endure for the sake of truth. Mother Church tells us that the *soul* of Jesus, after his death, descended into hell,† and dwelt there as long as his *body* re-

* Symb. Constantinop., cap. 7.

† What the Catholics here mean by the word *hell* not one Protestant in a thousand *accurately* knows. "These abodes [signified by the word *hell*] are not all of one and the same nature; for amongst them is that most loathsome and dark prison, in which the souls of the damned, together with the unclean spirits, are tortured in eternal and unextinguishable fire. This dread abode is called Gehenna, the bottomless pit, and in its literal signification, hell. There is also the fire of Purgatory, in which the souls of just men are purified by a temporary punishment, to qualify them to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth. The truth of this doctrine, which holy Councils declare to be founded on Scripture and confirmed by Apostolic tradition, the pastor has occasion to make the subject of his more diligent and frequent exposition, as we are fallen on times when men endure not sound doctrine. Lastly, a third sort of receptacle is that in which were received the souls of the just who died before Christ, and where, without any sense of pain, supported by the blessed hope of redemption, they enjoyed a tranquil abode. These pious souls, then, who in the bosom of Abraham were expecting the Saviour, Christ the Lord liberated, *descending into hell*." — Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. vi. 3.

mained in the grave; that his soul was reunited to his body early on the morning of the third day; that he rose "by his own power and virtue, a singular prerogative, peculiar to him alone"; but we do not consider it worth our while to inquire how she possessed herself of such curious and minute information.

The resurrection of Christ, which the Church affirms to be the source of our resurrection, "both as to its efficient cause and its model," — that it was necessary in order "to manifest the justice of God," and "complete the mystery of our salvation," — we are content to regard as the type of a spiritual resurrection proposed to a soul dead in sin. For the Apostle says, "As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."*

The divine mystery of the Ascension is expressed in the following portion of the Apostles' Creed: "He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty." The faithful are unhesitatingly to believe that Jesus Christ, having fully accomplished the work of redemption, ascended *as man, body and soul*, into heaven; but as *God*, he never forsook heaven, filling, as he does, all places with his Divinity.† The sitting on "the right hand of God" is acknowledged to be merely figurative. All Christians agree in regarding the ascension of Christ as the crowning glory of his mission to the world; therefore we heartily concur with our Catholic brethren in saying, "He ascended, to prove thereby that 'his kingdom is not of this world'; for the kingdoms of this world are transient, based upon wealth and power of the flesh; whilst that of Christ is not, as the Jews expected, an earthly, but a spiritual and eternal kingdom." Its riches he shows to be spiritual, by placing his throne in the heavens; and in this kingdom they are to be considered to abound most in opulence and affluence of every sort, who are most diligent in seeking the things that are God's. "He also ascended into heaven, in order to teach us to follow him thither in mind and heart; for as, by his death and resurrection, he had left us an example of dying and rising again in spirit, so by his

* Rom. vi. 4.

† Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. vii. 1.

ascension he teaches us, though dwelling on earth, to raise ourselves in thought to heaven.”* According to the teachers of the faithful, he also ascended into heaven, that on the tenth day he might send the Holy Ghost; that he might appear in the presence of God as an advocate for us; that he might prepare for us a place, by opening the gates of celestial glory which had been closed by the sin of Adam. How they know that “he introduced with himself, into the mansions of eternal bliss, the souls of the just which he had liberated from prison,” in his descent into hell, we are not informed, and are not able to conjecture.

In the system of Catholic doctrine, Christ is invested with three offices,—those of Redeemer, Patron, and Judge. By his passion and death, he has redeemed the race; by his ascension into heaven, he has undertaken a perpetual advocacy of our cause; by his coming, at the end of the world, he shall judge the living and the dead. There are, however, two judgments,—one particular, the other general. “When each of us departs this life, he is instantly placed before the tribunal of God, where all that he has ever done, or spoken, or thought, is subjected to the strictest scrutiny; and this is called the particular judgment.”† The general judgment will be “when, on the same day in the same place, all men shall stand together before the tribunal of their Judge, that, in the presence and hearing of the whole world, each may know his final doom.”‡ The particular judgment is for the soul alone; the general, for soul and body, after the resurrection.§ We all know the story of the sheep and the goats. All we need say of it here is, that the Catholics, with many more, take it in its *literal* sense. The Church has always commended herself to the imaginations of men, by presenting her doctrines in material forms and sensuous images; no wonder, then, that the children of genius cherished in her bosom have delighted to represent, in poetry and painting, the closing scene of the world. In such representations, each artist has given the “color of his own soul” to his picture, so that we

* Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. vii. 6.

† Idem, cap. viii. 3.

‡ An argument for the general resurrection, ut *corpora* vel *præmium* vel *pœnam* cum *animo* ex æquo participant. Idem, 4.

have a figure of speech made visible, with various hues, to the eye. Fra Angelico makes the blessed doubly blessed, and the lost sweetly damned. Michel Angelo makes the redeemed take heaven by storm, piling mountain upon mountain of glory, with Titanic power of praise; while the lost, like Milton's fiends, add new sublimity to hell. Rubens shocks all Paradise, by introducing naked men and women, huge and gross, singing, for aught we see to the contrary, a delectable bacchanalian hymn; and tumbles his lost sinners, one over the other, "with hideous ruin and combustion, down to bottomless perdition." Nor is there wanting, here and there, a heathenish element. We noticed at Rome, in the Last Judgment of the Sistine Chapel, the antique Charon ferrying some of the Christian damned over the mythologic Styx, beating the rebellious down with his oar;—

"Batte col remo qualunque s' adagia." *

"I believe in the Holy Ghost," says the Apostolic symbol of faith, and all Christians join in the confession. But when Trinitarians, whether Catholic or Protestant, for those simple words of the most ancient creed, substitute the declaration, "that the Holy Ghost is equally God with the Father and the Son, equal to them, equally omnipotent, eternal, all-perfect, the Supreme Good, infinitely wise, and of the same nature with the Father and the Son,"† we, regarding it as a religious duty to preserve the reason—the eye of the soul—with which the Creator has endowed us, cannot follow them; for, among a thousand objections that rapidly present themselves, we find that belief, without an *intelligent* basis, is the very essence of superstition and spiritual suicide. How "the Holy Ghost is a distinct person from the Father and Son,"—how "he proceeds from the Father and Son," and at the same time "is equally God with the Father and the Son,"—we leave for those to explain who regard belief in such a dogma necessary, in order to escape eternal damnation. Some of the half-civilized Orientals think to please and propitiate their Di-

* Dante, Inferno, Canto Terzo, v. 111.

† Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. ix. 4.

vinity by mutilating the body. Many Christians in Europe and America, with the same end in view, mutilate the mind.

"Under the word Church," say the expounders of Catholic doctrine, "are comprehended no unimportant mysteries, for, in this 'calling forth,' which the word *Ecclesia* (Church) signifies, we at once recognize the benignity and splendor of divine grace, and understand that the Church is very unlike all other commonwealths; for they rest on human reason and human prudence, this on the wisdom and counsels of God; for he called us internally by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who opens the hearts of men, and externally through the labor and ministry of pastors and preachers."* "The Holy Catholic Church" consists of two parts, the one called the Church Triumphant, the other the Church Militant.† "The Church Triumphant is that most glorious and happy assemblage of blessed saints, and of those who have triumphed over the world, the flesh, and the Devil, and who, now free and secure from the troubles of this life, are blessed with the fruition of everlasting bliss. The Church Militant is the society of all the faithful still dwelling on earth, and is called militant because it wages eternal war with those implacable enemies, the world, the flesh, and the Devil. We are not hence to infer that there are two Churches: they are two constituent parts of the same Church; one part gone before, and now in possession of its heavenly country; the other, following every day, until at length, united to its invisible Head, it shall repose in the enjoyment of endless felicity." The Church on earth, or the Church Militant, is composed of two classes, the good and the bad. Good and bad are linked together by the same form, by profession of the same faith, by participation in the same sacraments; but the good alone are united by the spirit of grace and the bond of charity. The bad remain attached to the Church, as dead limbs remain upon the living tree. None but infidels, heretics, schismatics, and the excommunicated are excluded from the pale of the Church. As for the bad within her pale, were even the lives of her ministers debased perchance by crime, they are not therefore excluded from her,

* Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. x. 3.

† Idem, 5.

nor do they on that account lose any part of the power with which her ministry invests them.* The essential characteristic of the Church is her unity. She has "one ruler, one governor, the invisible one, Christ; the visible one, him who, as the legitimate successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles, occupies the See of Rome." The visible head is necessary to preserve unity of form, as the invisible is necessary to preserve unity of spirit, in the Church. She is also holy, catholic, and apostolic;—holy, because the faithful, though offending in many things, have been made the people of God, have consecrated themselves to Christ by baptism and faith; catholic, because universal; apostolic, because her doctrines are truths neither novel nor of recent origin, but delivered of old by the Apostles, and disseminated throughout the world. She is presided over by the Holy Ghost, and from the beginning has had none but apostolic and consecrated ministers. Her foundation is the "rock of ages," and was laid by the immortal God himself. To her have been confided the keys of Heaven's kingdom; to her it has been granted to remit sins, and strike with the lightning of excommunication. Notwithstanding her exalted character and high prerogatives, we are not to believe *in* the Church as *in* God, Christ, the Holy Ghost, but simply to regard her as a divinely appointed instrument of grace.

And the unity of spirit by which the Church is governed establishes among all her members a community of spiritual blessings, which constitutes the essence of "the communion of saints." Although the word *communion* belongs in a special manner to the eucharist, it implies also an harmonious participation in all the sacraments of the Church. As every pious and holy action, done by one, belongs to all, and becomes profitable to all through charity, which "seeketh not her own," so the communion of saints may be said to be of action as well as faith. This community of sacraments, of belief, of holy works, is confined to the living branches of the Vine, whilst

* "De cæteris autem quamvis improbis et sceleratis hominibus, adhuc eos in Ecclesia perseverare dubitandum non est; idque fidelibus tradendum assidue, ut si forte Ecclesiæ Antistitum vita flagitiosa sit, eos tamen in Ecclesia esse, nec propterea quidquam de eorum potestate detrahi certò sibi persuadeant."—Idem, 9.

the dead branches, those who are bound in the thralldom of sin, and estranged from the grace of God, are deprived of the nourishing spirit that flows through its appointed channels. "However, as they are in the Church, they are assisted in recovering lost grace and life by those who live by the spirit, and enjoy those fruits which are, no doubt, denied to such as are entirely cut off from the communion of the Church."

"The forgiveness of sins" is one of the primary articles of belief in the Catholic Church, but is far from being held exclusively by her. The interpretation of it depends upon the "scheme of salvation" previously adopted. The faithful agree with all other Trinitarians in explaining its strictly doctrinal import, but they also adapt it to their ecclesiastical machinery. Baptism, it is true, remits all sins and the punishments due to them, but it does not give exemption from all the infirmities of nature, so that we are still liable to sin, especially in one direction,* while we are in the bosom of the Church. Therefore "the power of the keys" has been given to the representatives of Christ and his Apostles on earth, which extends to all sins. There is "no crime, however heinous, that can be committed or conceived, which the Church has not power to forgive. Such power is confided only to bishops and priests, not to the inferior clergy." We must not suppose, however, that the Church claims for her priests and bishops the power to forgive sins according to their own pleasure; she simply claims to be the depositary of the *instruments* whereby the Forgiver of sins accomplishes this. "Sin can be forgiven only through the sacraments, when duly administered. The Church has received no power otherwise to remit sin; whence it follows, that priests and the sacraments serve as instruments to the forgiveness of sins, by which Christ the Lord, the author himself and bestower of salvation, accomplishes in us the remission of sins, and justification."† We heartily concur with the authors of the Catechism, when they

* "Quin potius (cum unicuique nostrum adversus concupiscentiæ motus, quæ nos ad peccata incitare non desinit, pugnandum sit), vix ullum reperias, qui vel tam acriter resistat vel tam vigilanter salutem suam tueatur, ut omnes plagas vitare possit."

— Catech. Rom., Pars I. cap. xi. 3.

† Idem, 6.

say, "The ancient Fathers most truly declared that *God alone* can forgive sins, and that to *his* infinite goodness and power *alone* is so wonderful a work to be referred";* but, keeping this in mind, we are unable to construe to thought, and leave it for others to construe to faith, what they mean when they add, "Christ remits sins by virtue of *his own* authority; all others by virtue of authority delegated to them as his ministers."†

It is not necessary to dwell upon the Catholic doctrine of "the resurrection of the body." They strongly condemn the belief that the New Testament meaning of the resurrection may be a rising up of the spirit from its death in sin to life in Christ. As the body alone dies, so is it the body alone that has a resurrection. We do not see how it is that, "while the soul is separated from the body, man cannot enjoy the consummation of happiness, replete with every good"; but the faithful are required thus to believe. Not alone the good, but also the bad, shall have a resurrection of the body. Each, too, shall have his own body at the final uprising of the world. Upon the morn of that new *aion*, when the myriads of the dead shall come forth from their mortal resting-places, no body shall appear maimed or halt, gross or emaciated, but perfected in all its parts, so that, when united with its good or wicked soul, it may be more sensitive to joy or pain. Only the scars of the martyrs shall remain to their glory, "shining with a brilliancy far more refulgent than that of gold and precious stones, even as the wounds of Christ":‡ —

"Te fa maravigliar, perchè ne vedi
La region degli angeli dipinta."§

Owing to the victory of Christ over death, the bodies of good and bad shall rise immortal. "Impassibility," "brightness,"

* Idem, 8.

† Idem, 9. Both of these passages are conclusive as to the claim of the Church independently to remit sins.

‡ S. Augustine, Civ. Dei, Lib. XXII. cap. xix.: "Non enim deformitas in eis [martyribus], sed dignitas erit, et quædam, quamvis in corpore, non corporis, sed virtutis pulchritudo fulgebit."

§ Dante, Paradiso, Canto Ventesimo, vv. 101, 102. Wright's version: —

"Wonder excite, that with such gems arrayed
Should be the region where the angels dwell."

"agility," "subtily," are the qualities of a glorified body. Whence the Catholic doctors obtained such knowledge for the faithful, we cannot give even a Yankee guess, and we turn with joy from any sensuous representations of a future life, to the consolation which the thought of that life gives us, when we mourn the loss of those endeared to us by friendship, or connected by blood; to the relief it affords the troubled heart oppressed by the afflictions, and overwhelmed by the calamities, that seem to be inseparably connected with worldly existence. We agree with our brethren of Rome in regarding as a most powerful incentive to holy living the belief that we shall appear hereafter before the Almighty Judge, just as we are, in naked beauty, or deformity, of soul; but we are not very solicitous about the soul's garment of flesh, woven around us with threads of Fate by the fingers of Will.

The "life everlasting," in the Catholic creed, signifies, "not only that continuity of existence to which the devils and wicked are destined as well as the righteous, but also that perpetuity of happiness which is to fill up the desires of the blessed." Immortality — a never-ending *personal* existence — is the crowning glory of the Christian's faith, but, inasmuch as it is an article of belief common to all creeds, we need not dwell upon it here.

It was our intention to embrace in this view an exposition of the Seven Sacraments of Romanism. But we have occupied so much space that we cannot now speak of the "Form of the Church."

In dismissing the subject, we cannot forbear expressing a wish that the searching and radical movements of this age might move even that which has been for centuries past so rigid and stationary; that the Church, which once united the Latin and the German races in one communion, might so reform her corruptions, and so modify her doctrine and discipline, as to recover the lost sympathy and communication, if not affiliation, of the Protestant world, and thus realize in some true sense the catholicity which her title now vainly asserts. We believe in the possibility of a Catholic Church, as we believe that some Church is natural to man. We see provision for such a Church in human nature, and the promise of it in the

Christian revelation. We consider such a Church as the true consummation of all religion, — the realization of the spiritual bond by which all men are one in Christ. The true and catholic Church will combine the greatest liberty with the greatest union, consulting and conciliating all the wants of our spiritual nature, and concentrating all our powers in a spiritual worship which shall be united confession, by word and life, of one Lord, and united action for the common good.

ART. II. — THE MATERIAL CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Fifteenth Report to the Legislature of Massachusetts relating to the Registry and Return of Births, Marriages, and Deaths in the Commonwealth, for the Year ending December 31, 1856. By FRANCIS DE WITT, Secretary of the Commonwealth. Boston. 1857. 8vo. pp. xvi. and 287.

WE intend in this article to write of the material condition of the people of Massachusetts. In detail we shall treat of the number of the people; of their marriages; their births, and their deaths; then also of the property of the people; of idiocy, insanity, blindness, and sickness; of the means of education; and the means for the repression of crime. At the end of all, we shall offer some hints as moral, not to a fable, but to a fact. For convenience' sake, we put the statistics into tables, — apples of gold in vessels of silver.

I. *Of the Persons in the State.* — On the first day of June, 1855, there were in Massachusetts 1,132,369 persons. To-day the number is doubtless greater, but let it be considered as still the same.

1. They are thus divided in respect to race : —

9,767 are black men, of the African race, whereof 6,923 are pure negroes, 2,844 are mixed.

139 are red men, of the American or Indian race; of these six only are pure Indian, the rest are mixed with the blood

of other races. This is the poor remnant of the great savage population which filled up the land two hundred and fifty years ago, as confident in their "manifest destiny" as their civilized successors are to-day. It is painful to consider the fate of the thousands of men who once filled the forests of New England! We know of no justification for the conduct of our fathers, who often treated the Indians like beasts of prey. But even now the Americans are scarcely more merciful.

There are 1,122,463 of the Caucasian race: of these 877,280 are natives of the United States; 244,685 are foreigners; 498 are of unknown nativity.

Putting all together, black, red, and white, there are 886,575 inhabitants of Massachusetts who were born here, 245,263 foreigners, and 531 of doubtful origin. Besides, in 1850, 199,582 natives of Massachusetts were living elsewhere in the United States, and there are 30,000 or 40,000 probably now residing in other countries of the earth.

The historical growth of the population of Massachusetts is a little remarkable. In 1620, the first white settlers — not counting the Scandinavians who actually came in the Middle Ages — dropped their anchor in the shallow waters of "New Plymouth." The following tables show the subsequent growth in numbers. The first table is conjectural.

TABLE I. — *Population of Massachusetts from 1620 to 1775.*

Year.	Population.	Year.	Population.
1620	101	1749	220,000
1701	70,000	1775	352,000

TABLE II. — *Population of Massachusetts from 1790 to 1855.*

Year.	Population.	Year.	Population.
1790	378,717	1830	610,408
1800	423,245	1840	737,699
1810	472,041	1850	994,514
1820	523,287	1855	1,132,369

The figures of this last table rest on actual official count. Truly this is a pretty respectable increase in two hundred and thirty-five years. Our fathers started with Puritanism and

the wilderness, and this is the numeric result which has come of their ciphering!

2. They are thus distributed in respect to sex:—

550,034 are males, 582,335 are females; thus there are 32,301 more of womankind than of mankind in the State,—106 women to 100 men. More males are born every year, and more females die; still the women surpass the men. It is thought an excess of women migrates in, and an excess of men migrates out, and hence the perpetual superabundance of women and its unavoidable consequences.*

These persons live in 228,845 families, and occupy 175,311 dwellings.

3. They are thus distributed in respect to age. Human life may be divided into three periods: the Dependent age, from birth to 15; the Productive age, from 15 to 60; the Retiring age, from 60 to the end.

*TABLE III. — *Age of the Population.*

358,904 of the	Dependent age.	31.69	per cent of whole population.			
701,100	" Productive age.	61.91	"	"	"	"
70,024	" Retiring age.	6.40	"	"	"	"
2,341 of unascertained age.						

In 1855 there were 132,944 under 5, and 19 over 100. In the various countries of Europe the average age of all the population varies from 26 to 33; we do not know the figures for Massachusetts; the average of the dying we shall give in a subsequent page. Out of 100 persons, 32 are under 15; 62 between 15 and 60; 6 are over threescore; while only one out of 65,000 ever sees his hundredth birthday. We shall presently return to this matter of longevity.

4. The adult males are thus occupied in various trades. On the 1st of June, 1855, there were 333,542 males in the State over fifteen years of age, whose industrial business was reported in the census of that year. We give the result on the next page.

* In Upper Canada there are 46,128 more males than females. Yet there are 15,528 widows, and only 8,742 widowers.

TABLE IV. — *Occupations of the People.*

Business.	Number.	Percentage.
Mechanics,	122,251	36.63
Laborers,	60,248	18.06
Farmers,	57,031	17.10
Traders,	29,039	8.71
Mariners and boatmen,	16,346	4.91
Factory operatives,	8,801	2.64
Professional men,	8,312	2.49
Manufacturers,	5,294	1.59
Miscellaneous work,	26,220	7.87
Total,	333,542	100.00

About 41,000 men work upon leather, either in manufacturing the article or moulding it into various forms. There are 1,800 doctors; 1,750 ministers, of large and small denominations; 1,545 printers; 1,584 coopers; 1,116 lawyers; and 1,080 peddlers. Thus out of 100 males over fifteen years old, 3 work in factories; 5 are sailors; 9 are traders; 17 are farmers; 18 are laborers; and 37 mechanics, of whom 12 work upon leather; every eighth man in the State is a shoemaker.

If we look back to the history of productive industry in Massachusetts we shall see that a great change has taken place. A large part of the men are now at work under cover, in factories and shops, and are also dependent on some man or corporation who employs them. It was not so a hundred years ago, when the majority worked each man for himself, and the great mass of the people in the open air. This change in the industry of the people brings with it important consequences, which appear in the size, health, and longevity of the people, and also in the amount of their free individuality. There is less physical strength in a thousand workingmen now than in 1750, we think; less individual freedom of thought and manly independence. The industrial, like other battles, is won with a loss. Man's body comes into equilibrium with the circumstances it is exposed to, oscillating for a while between its maximum and minimum of energy; the spirit of man also accommodates itself to its surroundings, as any one can see in England, Spain, and Turkey.

" 'T is the day of the chattel,
 Web to weave, and corn to grind:
 Things are in the saddle,
 And ride mankind.
 There are two laws discrete,
 Not reconciled, —
 Law for man, and law for things;
 The last builds town and fleet,
 But it runs wild,
 And does the man unking."

II. *Of the Marriages of the People.** — Here we take the facts for the year ending December 31, 1856. No State returns of a later date have yet been published, but the returns of the city of Boston come down a year later.

In 1856 there were 12,265 couples married in Massachusetts. The number is 1,418 less than that of 1854. Is marriage diminishing in Massachusetts? The extravagant habits of luxurious men and women put marriage out of the reach of many, vanity prevailing over affection. As flounces increase in number and greatness in size, wives diminish and lessen. A woman becomes an article of luxury. It is instructive to notice the proportion between the marriages of natives and foreigners. Mr. De Witt has put the wedlock of four years into a table as follows.

TABLE V. — *Marriages in Massachusetts from 1853 to 1856.*

Nativity of the Parties.	1853.	1854.	1855.	1856.	1853 - 6.
Both parties American,	7,381	7,492	6,918	6,818	28,609
" " foreign,	4,057	4,797	4,269	4,323	17,446
Amer. groom, foreign bride,	485	542	467	495	1,989
Foreign groom, Amer. bride,	458	512	487	487	1,944
Nativity not ascertained,	447	340	188	142	1,117
Total,	12,828	13,683	12,329	12,265	

Of the 2,536 men who were married in Boston in 1856, only 1,033 were born in the United States, while 1,503 were foreign-

* Fifteenth Report to the Legislature of Massachusetts relating to the Registry and Return of Births, Marriages, and Deaths in the Commonwealth for the Year ending December 31, 1856. By Francis De Witt, &c. Boston. 1857.

Report of the City Registrar of the Births, Marriages, and Deaths in the City of Boston for the Year 1857. Boston. 1858.

ers,—960 of whom were natives of Ireland. Of the 2,536 women married here in that year, only 989 were natives of the United States, but 341 of whom were born in Boston; while 1,080 Irishwomen were made joyful with so many men. With that class extravagance does not hinder wedlock. The poor can always afford marriage.

In the whole State, the American outnumber the foreign marriages.

It is always interesting to know at what age the parties become one, so we have constructed the following table.

TABLE VI.—*Age at the Time of Marriage.*

	Under 20.	20 to 25.	25 to 30.	30 to 35.	35 to 40.	40 to 50.	Above 50.
Males,	206	5,096	3,641	1,422	694	632	391
Females,	2,739	5,493	2,235	751	353	304	457

Two boys of 16 were married; 1 girl of 13; 11 of 14; 63 of 15; 176 of 16; and 32 of 17! The oldest bridegroom was between 75 and 80; the oldest bride was between 60 and 65. So it seems 23 per cent of the Massachusetts wives marry before 20; 45 per cent between 20 and 25; in other words, at 20 the maiden has escaped about one fourth part of the risks of being married, but sailing is now dangerous; at 25 a little more than two thirds of the peril is gone; while at 30 there is only about one chance in six that she will ever encounter that shipwreck.

In Kentucky, in 1855, out of 5,353 women who were married, and whose ages are recorded, it appears that 1 was married at 11; 8 at 13; 17 at 14; 2,260 under 20; 4,161 under 25. One woman at 73 married a man of 81. A maiden of 75 joined herself (and her estate) to a man of 25! "And may God Almighty have mercy on your souls!" would have been the appropriate benediction.

III. *Of the Number of Births.*—In 1856 there were 34,445 children born in Massachusetts. Out of 200 of these babies about 103 are boys and 97 girls; this rule seems to be nearly constant in our State. Of these children 15,908 had both parents Americans, while 16,513 had a foreigner for father or mother; the nativity of the parents of 2,024 was not ascertained. The illegitimate births are reported as only 257, of

which 118 took place in the two State almshouses. But this matter is not investigated as it should be; the number of extra-matrimonial births is greater, though probably much less than in any other country of Christendom.

The proportion of children of foreign extraction varies in different parts of the State. Thus, in the County of Suffolk, there were 6,251 births; but only 1,634 children had an American father and mother, while 3,955 had both parents foreign: only 1,881 had American fathers; but 4,202 had foreign fathers. Suffolk County is only a New England "County Cork"; Boston is but the "Dublin" of America. 5,866 babies were born in Boston in 1856; only 1,670 had American fathers, only 902 Massachusetts fathers, only 428 Boston fathers; while more than 2,900 children had both parents Irish. Thirty pairs of Irish twins crowded into the world of Boston that year!

In the seven years from 1850 to 1856 there were but 13,182 children born in Suffolk County to American fathers; while the foreign fathers rejoiced in the paternity of 26,924 children. In one case three Irish children rushed at one birth into the land of promise. Not long since a true Hibernian birth took place: a woman was delivered of twins, one of whom was born in 1855 and the other in 1856. This, we take it, could happen only in the case that both parents were Irish!

Some parts of Boston are more fertile than others. Thus, in 1856, in Ward 2 (East Boston) there was one birth for every 21 persons; while in Ward 4 there was but one birth to 63 persons. In Ward 2 every eleventh female bore a child that year. In the whole city there was one birth to every 27.48 persons. The birth of colored children was only one in 44.40; in 1857, it was but one in 65. This comparative sterility of colored women in Boston is a remarkable fact. Is the climate too severe for these children of the tropics? or is the cause found in the abandoned life of many colored women?

At the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Cheltenham, in 1856, Mr. Clibborn read a remarkable paper "On the Tendency of European Races to become Extinct in the United States." His purpose was to

exhibit the "probability of the extinction on the continent of North America, not only of the Celtic or Irish race, but of all other European races, provided intercourse with Europe is entirely interrupted." A writer in the Boston Daily Advertiser some time since showed the absurdity of this opinion, and mentioned that the population of the United States increases "six times as fast as Great Britain, and ten times as fast as France." We would add a few facts, gathered from other sources, showing that population is not likely to cease at present. Dr. Wetherspoon, of the United States Army, reports that in the neighborhood of Fort Kent, on the St. John's River in Maine, on the British side of that river, some of the Celtic descendants of old Acadians are settled: in 12 families living within a mile of the garrison, and taken without exception, there were 93 children; the married life of the 24 parents was in all but 162 years, — a child for every $20\frac{1}{2}$ months! M. Burgoyne had 18 children by his first wife, 2 by the second. His oldest daughter has been married 11 years, and had 8 children; his mother had three pairs of twins. M. Ferriand has had 26 children by one wife; she was 53 years old when the last was born! M. Le Crog had 19 children in 18 years, — five pairs of twins. M. Cire has had 22 children, all single births; his wife was 14 at marriage, now 43. There are six families at Green River, within the space of a mile, who have had in all 106 children, — an average of 17.66 births to a marriage. Four women had 84 children! Marriage of girls at 13 or 14 is not uncommon. The wife of Jacque Camel had been married 11 years, and has had 7 children, all now living except the first, who died at the age of four. "She has always been in the habit of nursing her children from one birth to another."* The settlers in Canada, as well as the United States, have proved that the country is not one "that eateth up the inhabitants thereof."† We know a gentleman whose six American male ancestors will average 77

* Statistical Report on the Sickness and Mortality in the Army of the United States, from July, 1839, to July, 1855, (Washington, 1856, 4to,) p. 24 *et seq.*

† Census of the Canadas, 1851-2, (2 vols. 8vo, Quebec, 1853-4,) Vol. I. pp. xi, xv-xix, *et passim*; Vol. II. p. 22 *et seq.*, where there are some remarkable statistics of health and longevity. See, too, Annual Report of the Schools in Upper Canada for 1855, (1 vol. 8vo, Toronto, 1856,) pp. 48 *et seq.*, 162 *et seq.*

at death, while the six females come up to 80! Such examples are not uncommon. The descendants of the white man and the red woman are short-lived.

IV. *Of the Number of Deaths.*—20,734 died in Massachusetts in 1856.—10,201 were males; 10,401, females; 132 were of unreported sex.

1. In the whole State the average age at death was 26.97; in Dukes County, 45.53; in Suffolk County, 19.98. In Suffolk, ten persons at death have lived about 200 years; in Dukes, about 460. In Middlesex, the average age at death is 25.31; in Bristol, Essex, Hampden, and Worcester, about 28; in Franklin, 34.64. Have the Irish and other Celtic people less tenacity of life than the Anglo-Saxons and their Teutonic kindred, or do circumstances cause the difference in duration of life? 4,226 died under one year. More than one fifth of all deaths are of babies not a year old; more than two fifths die before five. In Boston, the number of those who die before five is greater than all the deaths between 5 and 60; thus here the chances of death in the first 5 years are greater than in the next 55! Here the average age of all at death is about 20; of the native Americans, about 25; of the colored people, 27; of the foreigners, 17. It is often said the Africans in New England have less vitality than any other people. These facts do not support the theory. But in 1857, the average age of colored persons at death was only 25.24, while that of other native Americans was 27.57.

2. Women attain a greater age than men. Perhaps this is so in all countries. The following table shows the age at death of the various classes of men and women.

TABLE VII.—*Age of Foreign and Native Males and Females at Death.*

Native-born females, at death, will average	.	.	.	29.94
Native-born males, " "	.	.	.	27.57
Foreign-born females, " "	.	.	.	17.93
Foreign-born males, " "	.	.	.	17.00
Native-born colored females, " "	.	.	.	25.46
Native-born colored males, " "	.	.	.	24.79

American males live ten years more than foreign males, and American females twelve years more than their sisters from

abroad. Let us divide life as before into three periods, — the Dependent, from birth to 15; the Productive, from 15 to 60; the Retiring, from 60 till death, — and see what number die in each period. We omit all whose age is not ascertained.

TABLE VIII. — *Distribution of Death according to Age and Sex.* 1856.

	Dependent Age.	Productive Age.	Retiring Age.
Males,	4,907	3,451	1,763
Females,	4,301	4,091	1,937
Total,	9,208	7,542	3,700

The mortality of males is greatest in the first period, while that of women takes precedence in the two others. The causes which produce this increased sacrifice of male life in the first fifteen years are not yet well ascertained.

The following table contains facts for the years 1852–56, and shows the comparative mortality of men and women at different ages.

TABLE IX. — *Distribution of Death according to Sex and Age.*
1852–56.

	Under 1.	Under 5.	Between 20 and 30.	Over 30.
Males,	12,245	20,782	4,888	24,446
Females,	9,061	17,684	6,787	26,480
Total,	21,306	38,466	11,675	50,926

Here, too, the superior longevity of woman appears.

The same law prevails in other countries. Mr. Neison furnishes the facts for England,* whence we have constructed the following table:—

TABLE X. — *Expectation of Life in England.*

Age.	For Males.	For Females.	Age.	For Males.	For Females.
10	47.75	48.38	50	20.84	22.05
15	44.17	44.99	60	14.58	15.53
20	40.69	41.59	70	9.21	9.84
25	37.34	38.36	80	5.21	5.63
30	34.09	35.16	90	2.89	3.09
40	27.47	28.73	100	2.13	1.87

* Contributions to Vital Statistics, being a Development of the Rate of Mortality and the Laws of Sickness, &c., &c. By F. G. P. NEISON. Third edition. London. 1857. 1 vol. 4to. See pp. 40, 607, 615.

The same law appears in Belgium. We gather the curious statistics from M. Quetelet's celebrated book.* In Belgium the males and females are nearly equal in number.

TABLE XI. — *Comparative Vitality of Males and Females.*

					In Cities.	In Country.
For 100 females stillborn there are					133 males.	170 males.
For 100 females who die there are in first 3 mos.					130	126
"	"	"	"	3 to 12 mos.	115	109
"	"	"	"	1 to 5 yrs.	103	90.50
"	"	"	"	5 to 14	90	93
"	"	"	"	14 to 18	82	75
"	"	"	"	18 to 21	98	92
"	"	"	"	21 to 40	104	86.33
"	"	"	"	40 to 50	102	83
"	"	"	"	50 to 60	107	118
"	"	"	"	60 to 70	96	105
"	"	"	"	70 to 80	77	100
"	"	"	"	80 to 100	68	92

In Boston the colored people furnish a striking exception to the general rule ; 38 colored males died here in 1856, and 33 colored females ; the average age of the former was 30 years, of the latter, a little less than 25. It should be remembered that many colored females belong to the lowest class of prostitutes. There are but two places in New England where the colored are regarded as entitled to the same rights with the whites, — one is the lowest haunt of corruption, the other the company of the most religious and humane of all philanthropists.

3. The deaths are thus distributed among natives and foreigners, males and females : —

TABLE XII. — *Distribution of Deaths in 1856.*

Native Americans.		Foreigners.	
16,678.		3,191.	
Males,	8,186	Males,	1,633.
Females,	8,391	Females,	1,557
Sex not reported,	101	Sex not reported,	1

* Sur l'Homme et le Developpement de ses Facultés, &c., (Paris, 1855, 2 vols. 8vo,) Vol. I. p. 157.

During the last three years about 16 per cent of all deaths in Massachusetts have been those of foreigners.

It is instructive to look at the causes of death: 841 died by violence last year, — most of them by accident, that is, by some man's carelessness. In the 15 years and 8 months ending December 31, 1856, no less than 4,081 persons have perished here by violence: whereof 3 were hanged by the sheriff; 108 were murdered; 860 committed suicide, — 101 in 1856; and 3,110 came to an end by "other violent causes" not distinctly named in the reports. Americans are singularly reckless of life; but yet suicide is less common in Massachusetts than in many other civilized countries. Thus, by the celebrated Gotha tables — calculated from the narrow basis of 2,807 lives — it appears that one death out of 44 was by suicide.* The population of London is less than double that of Massachusetts, but its suicides are more than twice as many, varying from 203 to 266 a year. This crime is on the increase in Massachusetts.

TABLE XIII. — *Increase of Suicides from 1849 to 1856.*

Year.	No. of Suicides.	Year.	No. of Suicides.
1849	67	1853	67
1850	49	1854	82
1851	57	1855	91
1852	76	1856	101

The greater proclivity of the male to violence appears in the number of suicides, — 71 per cent are male, 29 female. "*Omnis natura in re minima*," is an old rule. The greatest number of Massachusetts suicides takes place in May. It seems in Europe this crime is more common amongst Protestants than Catholics. Any thoughtful man would expect it to be in some proportion to the amount of freedom of thought and individual self-direction. Babies don't fall till they begin to go alone; while in the cradle, they break no bones.

Many children are born dead. Infanticide takes two forms, — ante-natal and post-natal. The law of Massachusetts regards the latter as a crime, and punishes it as other forms of

* See Neison, *ubi supra*, p. 189 *et seq.* Also Buckle's History of Civilization, (London, 1857,) Vol. I. p. 26 *et seq.*

murder; but it takes no notice of the former. We cannot furnish the statistics of abortion; but judging from what we have learned, they would be more frightful than those of any other form of New England crime. It is not less murder to destroy the life of a child in a woman's body, than in a man's cradle, or a public highway. If thoughtful men do not ascertain the extent of this enormity, — and that among "respectable" women, — by noticing the average number of children to a marriage, or by reading the advertisements of abortionists in the public papers, they may ask any intelligent physician of this town, and he will tell them facts we do not care to shame these pages with. Much of the mortality of children in the first three years of life may often be traced to the mother's efforts to be no mother.*

Of the 20,748 who died in 1856, we find 978 died of old age; 4 of these had reached the respectable period of 100, or more. Old age, we take it, is the only death that is natural to man and unavoidable.

It is not our purpose to give an account of the various diseases which have made havoc of men; we leave that to the physicians. But we would call attention to the effect of a man's business and his locality on the length of his life.

In the 12 years and 8 months ending with 1856, 38,027 persons over 20 years old have died in Massachusetts, whose age and business were ascertained and reported in the official documents. The facts are shown in the following table.

TABLE XIV. — *Of Occupation and Longevity.*

Occupation.	No. of Persons.	Aggregate Length of Life.	Average Age at Death.
Farmers,	10,741	689,466	64.19
Coopers,	305	17,790	58.32
Lawyers,	188	10,746	57.15
Ministers,	265	15,108	57.01
Shipwrights,	275	15,456	56.20
Doctors,	366	20,088	54.85
Blacksmiths,	743	38,513	51.83

* See some remarks on this matter in Transactions of the American Medical Association for 1857, (New York, 1857, 1 vol. 8vo,) p. 93 *et seq.*

Occupation.	No. of Persons.	Aggregate Length of Life.	Average Age at Death.
Wheelwrights,	167	8,586	51.41
Carpenters,	1,679	83,365	49.65
Merchants and traders,	1,674	83,099	49.36
Tanners and curriers,	214	10,284	48.05
Tavern-keepers,	158	7,581	47.98
Masons,	401	19,017	47.42
Cabinet-makers,	228	10,735	47.08
Seamen,	2,561	118,366	46.21
Laborers,	7,300	326,324	44.71
Manufacturers,	343	15,231	44.40
Stonecutters,	223	9,792	43.91
Shoemakers,	2,741	118,489	43.22
Mechanics,	466	20,101	43.13
Tailors,	346	14,655	42.35
Painters,	429	18,095	42.18
Machinists,	409	15,350	37.55
Printers,	150	5,490	36.60

It is now quite clear that in all civilized countries the average life of man is lengthening; yet it may be doubtful whether cases of extreme longevity are on the increase. We have never found any well-authenticated case of a man reaching his two-hundredth year. Thomas Parr was born in Shropshire, England, in 1483, and died in 1635, nearly 153 years old. He worked at farming till about 130; when 116 or 118, it is said, he became unlawfully the father of a child, and was punished ecclesiastically by walking on Sunday in a white sheet in front of the church in his parish. He married for the last time when near 120. At his death Dr. Harvey opened the body and found no signs of decay. One of his grandsons died at 120. In 1670 Henry Jenkins died in Yorkshire at the age of 169. Petrach Czartan, an Hungarian peasant, was born in 1587, and died in 1772, aged 185.* This is the greatest age we find in any authentic history, — if, indeed, the facts be well established.

In the year 76 the census of Italy was taken, and in the "eighth region," between the Apennines and the Po, there were 124 persons over 100 years of age; three of

* New American Encyclopædia, Art. *Age*.

them were 140; at Rimini, Marcus Aponius was then living at 150.* Lord Bacon collects several cases of great age in his History of Life and Death; but some of them are poorly vouched for.† He says "the old Countess of Desmond" lived to 140. We remember to have heard it said of her in some verses, —

" Who lived to much more than a hundred and ten,
And died by a fall from a cherry-tree then.
What a frisky old girl! "

It is said the famous John of Times (Johannes de Temporibus, so called for the ages he lived through) saw 361 years, but the statement lacks confirmation.‡ M. Prosper Lucas, in a recent work, says that on the 12th of January, 1763, in the hamlet of Conino in Russia, there died a woman named Margaret Cribstowna, wife of Gaspard Raycoul. She was 108 years old. She married him, her third husband, when she was 94 and he 105; they had three children born in that wedlock, all living at their mother's death; the children's hair was white, they had no teeth, but cavities in the gums as if the teeth had been removed; they were of the ordinary size for their age, but crooked in the back, having a faded complexion, with all the other signs of decrepitude. The same author relates that the wife of one of the coachmen of Charles X. bore a child at the age of 65, who likewise had all the marks of senility.§ Wanley tells of a "Cornish beggar," an Irishman by birth, of whom this epitaph was written: —

" Here Brawne, the quondam beggar, lies,
Who counted by his tale
Some sixscore winters and above,
Such virtue is in ale.

* Livius, H. N., Lib. VII. c. 50. But Sillig, in his admirable edition, reads 140. See also Gruteri Inscript. 302.

† Works, edited by Ellis and Spedding, (London, 1857,) Vol. II. p. 132 *et seq.*

‡ Wanley's Wonders of the Little World, (London, 1788,) p. 64.

§ *Traité de l'Hérédité Naturelle*, (Paris, 1850, 2 vols. 8vo,) Tom. II. p. 462 *et seq.* On p. 496 *et seq.*, see cases of remarkable precocity. Beyerlink has made a collection of cases of long life in his *Theatrum Vitæ Humanæ*, Art. *Longævitas* and *Vitæ* (p. 171), where the reader will find curious things. The common works on Longevity require no mention here.

Ale was his meat, his drink, his cloth,
Ale did his death deprive,
And could he still have drank his ale,
He had been still alive !”

Seventy-one men settled in the town of Newton, Mass., towards the middle of the seventeenth century. The age of thirty of them at death is ascertained; they averaged a little more than 69.*

V. *Of the Property of the People.*—1. In 1840 the taxable property of Massachusetts was valued at \$307,089,196. In 1850, at \$597,936,460. At the present day it is thought to be about \$1,000,000,000. This does not include the untaxed property, real and personal, belonging to churches, schools, academies, colleges, and literary, scientific, and benevolent institutions, which would amount to \$100,000,000 more. This property is more than \$880 to each person in the State. It is more than a dollar a piece to the human race. Less than 250 years ago Massachusetts started with a few Puritans and the wilderness for outfit, and now in eight generations she has accumulated so much property that she could give a dollar to each of the thousand million inhabitants of the earth, and still have all her schools, meeting-houses, town-houses, alms-houses, jails, and literary, benevolent, and scientific institutions, left as nest-eggs to begin the world anew. We have done pretty well for beginners.

This great mass of property is more uniformly distributed than in any of the countries of Europe; but we think less uniformly than in any other New England State, with the exception of Rhode Island. It is pleasant to know that there are 86 Savings Banks in Massachusetts, in which about 177,000 depositors hold property, amounting to more than \$33,000,000, about \$30 to each man, woman, and child in the State. No depositor, we think, draws interest when his principal amounts to more than \$500. The Irish are an acquisitive people, with a considerable instinct for hoarding. In the great towns they have much property in these benevolent institutions. On the other hand, the Africans are more tropical in their habits, hoard little, and have not much property in the Savings Banks

* See Jackson's History of Newton, (Boston, 1814,) p. 9 *et seq.*

or elsewhere. Yet in Louisville we are told of large estates in their hands.

We have not been able to procure the statistics of municipal taxation in Massachusetts. Each of the 333 towns manages its own affairs, and no law requires any return of the amount of money collected. But it would be quite interesting to know the sum raised, and compare the expenses of different towns. The county taxes, it is officially known, have been on the increase continually, for the last ten years. Thus, in 1848, the tax in twelve counties—all except Suffolk and Nantucket—was \$233,575; in 1857 it had swollen to \$526,535. We are glad to learn that the present Governor, prompt and efficient in many things, is attempting to procure information on this matter.*

In 1857 the valuation of Boston was \$258,110,900. We should like to compare this with the property of South Carolina. We have not the facts before us, but we find her State taxes in 1856 were \$532,744; of this, \$290,488 came from negro slaves. Thus, the entire tax on property and free polls was only \$242,256, though each free colored person, children included, is doomed to pay \$2 a year. Hence it appears that more than half the wealth of that great State consists in the persons of its slaves. She had then 17,443,791 acres of taxable land, officially valued at \$10,284,001, or about 58 cents an acre.† In 1850 the entire property of South Carolina was estimated in the United States census at \$283,867,709. This included the value of the slaves. The city of Boston alone could buy up all the natural property, all the land and things, in that State, and still have a balance left sufficient to purchase several other slave States.

Property is less equally distributed in Boston than elsewhere in New England: a few men have great estates; many are thriving, but many also are poor.* The squalid poverty of New England, its drunkenness, prostitution, crime, flow

* See editorial in Boston Daily Advertiser for May 4, 1858.

† Report of the Comptroller-General to the Legislature of South Carolina, (Columbia (S. C.), 1856,) p. 22 *et al.* See also Governor Allston's Message for 1857. The last Annual Message of Mr. Chase, Governor of Ohio, is a model for papers of that kind, containing much valuable information not often found in gubernatorial documents.

hither as to a common sink. Boston has her perishing and her dangerous classes, whom no legislation lifts out from their wretchedness and vice. But we shall have a word for them on another page.

We have no means of estimating the annual value of the industry of the people in Massachusetts, or of the income from capital. But in 1855 an accurate census was made of the value of articles produced in the State, though no separation was made between the worth of the material and that of the labor bestowed upon it. From that examination it appeared that the value of articles produced by the people's labor in the year ending June 1, 1855, was \$295,820,681.79.* This is more than the worth of all the land and things in the two States of Virginia and South Carolina! Yet it is thought the census of 1855 did not return more than two thirds of the actual earnings of the people, but the real value of the articles produced here that year would be \$300,000,000. So the conceded earnings of that period would purchase all the land in Delaware, North Carolina, and Florida, at the government estimate, in 1850.

2. In the year ending November 1, 1857, it appears that 7,714 persons were received into the various almshouses of the three hundred and thirty-three towns in Massachusetts; besides, in the nine months ending the 1st of October, 2,778 other paupers were received into the State almshouses. Thus 10,492 persons were sheltered by the State or municipal charity during that period; on the average 5,837 persons were wholly supported in the various establishments of the towns or the Commonwealth.

Temporary relief was also municipally afforded to 17,181 others. Thus nearly 28,000 persons were more or less dependent on public charity. But of these nearly all whom the State relieved were foreigners; of the 25,000 helped by the towns, 8,300 were foreigners. Of the 10,492 indoor paupers, we think more than half were born abroad; but, by a strange defect in the public documents, we are not able to verify our conjecture. Of the 25,000 helped by the towns, about 15,000 were brought to poverty by the intemperance of themselves or

* Statistical Information relating to Certain Branches of Industry in Massachusetts, &c. Boston. 1856.

others! Of the 9,500 who had help from the charity of this county in 1856, less than 1,100 had a settlement in this State; about 8,500 of them were foreigners. Of the whole army of paupers in Suffolk County, more than 8,000 were brought to poverty by drunkenness, in themselves or others! To support this vast mass of pauperism, the towns and the State collectively paid \$641,192.41. Let us suppose that \$358,207.59 was given by private charity for the support of these or other poor persons. We have then \$1,000,000 given to help the indigent. If the value of the earnings of Massachusetts be but \$200,000,000, then our public and private charity of this kind is half of one per cent of the earnings of the people, — five mills on a dollar. Certainly it is not a very alarming piece of news.

VI. *Of Idiocy, Insanity, Blindness, and Sickness in Massachusetts.** — 1. On the 30th of September there were 63 idiotic or feeble-minded persons in the State institution at South Boston; 10 more had been there in the course of the year. There were also 58 other “idiotic or insane” persons in the various jails of the Commonwealth; thus 121 were in the public institutions of the State, most of them supported wholly at the public cost.

In the autumn of 1854 a census was made of all the idiotic and insane persons in Massachusetts. It was taken with great accuracy, and a careful and detailed Report made by Dr. Jarvis,† so well known for his devotion to those unfortunate persons. From that we construct this table.

TABLE XV. — *Of Idiots in Massachusetts.*

Native-born,	1,043
Foreigners,	44
Total,	1,087
Supported by friends,	670
Supported by the public,	417

* Tenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts School for Idiotic and Feeble-minded Youth. Boston. 1857.

Abstract of Returns of the Keepers of Jails and of the Overseers of the Houses of Correction for the Eleven Months ending September 30, 1857. Boston. 1857.

† Report on Insanity and Idiocy in Massachusetts, &c. Boston. 1855.

We shall again refer to this valuable document.

2. In the two public lunatic asylums at Worcester and Taunton,* 1,148 insane persons were received in the first eleven months of last year; 670 remained there on the 30th of November. The amount of insanity is quite large. It is caused by the great intellectual activity of the people, the intensity of business, lack of society, the failure of affection; by the vices of passion and the vices of ambition; by celibacy; by drunkenness; and by a dull and gloomy theology with unnatural ideas of God, of man, and of the relation between the two. In the last report of the asylum at Worcester we find an instructive array of facts, gathered from 3,390 cases, extending over 25 years, from 1833 to 1857. From them we construct the following table.

TABLE XVI. — *Of the Causes of Insanity.*

Causes.	Male.	Female.	Total.
Ill health in general,	135	467	602
Special diseases,	244	207	451
Troubles attending the reproductive function, .		184	184
Casualties, exposure, &c.,	98	75	173
Excitement, intellectual, moral, and affectional, &c.,	399	501	900
Religious excitement of all kinds,	132	170	302
Intemperance,	413	46	459
Self-abuse,	230	22	252
All other causes,	23	44	67
Total,	1,674	1,716	3,390

TABLE XVII. — *Showing the Percentage of the most Important Causes for 25 Years.*

General ill health,	16.4
Troubles on account of the affections,	10.8
Intemperance,	9.2
Troubles on account of religion,	5.5
Self-abuse,	5.2
Troubles on account of property,	4.7

* Twenty-Fifth Annual Report of the Trustees of the State Lunatic Hospital at Worcester. Boston. 1857.

Fourth Annual Report of the Trustees of the State Lunatic Hospital at Taunton. 1857.

Great pains have been taken with insane persons in Massachusetts; we think no State has made more generous or wise provisions for this unfortunate class. But we do not reach the cause of the evil. That is not to be removed by doctoring, but to be outgrown. To us, in this age of intense business, it is what leprosy once was to a slothful, sluggish, and unclean people, and will no doubt in like manner be outgrown. A man's occupation affects his sanity. We have found that the farmer lives longer than men of any other calling. It seems a little surprising to find how great is the tendency to insanity among the agricultural people. Out of 177 patients remaining at the Worcester Asylum, November 30, 1857, there were 30 farmers, 38 laborers, and 22 shoemakers. We are told on high authority, that there is more insanity in Connecticut than in any part of the world in proportion to the whole number of the people. The tendency to madness is stronger in celibates than among the married people. This follows naturally, and surprises no one.

In the autumn of 1854 a careful census was made to ascertain the number of lunatics in the State, and a valuable Report was published. The name of Dr. Jarvis is sufficient authority for the accuracy of the statements which we put into the following table.

TABLE XVIII. — *Of Lunacy of Massachusetts in 1854.*

Total number of lunatics in the State,	2,632
Males,	1,254
Females,	1,378
Natives,	2,007
Foreigners,	625
Independent, — Natives,	1,066
Foreigners,	44
	1,110
Paupers, — Natives,	941
Foreigners,	581
	1,522

At that time the foreign population was estimated at 230,000, and the native at 894,676. It seems the aliens had a greater ratio of insanity than the natives, which we represent by the following table.

TABLE XIX. — *Showing the Distribution of Insanity in Massachusetts.*

Natives that are lunatics,	1 in each	445 natives..
Natives that are pauper lunatics,	1 “	951 “
Foreigners that are lunatics,	1 “	368 foreigners.
Foreigners that are pauper lunatics,	1 “	399 “

Thus it appears that every four-hundredth foreigner is a crazy pauper. But this fact does not show a greater ethnological tendency to madness in them, only that their circumstances are unfavorable to their sanity. 93 per cent of the foreign lunatics are paupers! “Much of their insanity,” says Dr. Jarvis, “comes from the intemperance to which the Irish seem to be peculiarly prone.” The tendency to madness is a little greater in females than in males; this appears amongst both the native and the foreign population.

Of this great army of lunatics only 435 were supposed to be curable, while 2,018 were declared incurable, — crazy men to be supported for their life. The pecuniary cost is the smallest part of this grievous burden. It would be interesting to ascertain how much of this madness is inherited; but we have not as yet adequate means to determine that question.

Let us put both the idiots and lunatics together in the following table.

TABLE XX. — *Showing the Ratio of Lunatics and Idiots to the Whole Population.*

Population of Massachusetts, 1854.	Lunatics.	One in	Idiots.	One in	Lunatics and Idiots.	One in
1,124,676	2,632	427	1,087	1,034	3,719	302

Thus in Massachusetts in 1854, one man out of each 302 was either a crazy man or a natural fool.

3. The average number of blind persons at the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind was 124. 90 of these were pupils in the course of instruction, 24 were connected with the workshop department.*

4. *Of Sickness.*† — Health is the normal condition of man-

* Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, for the Year ending December 31, 1857. Boston. 1858.

† See Report of a General Plan for the Promotion of Public and Personal Health, devised, prepared, and recommended by the Commissioners appointed under a Resolve of the Legislature of Massachusetts, &c. Boston. 1850. 1 vol. 8vo.

kind; sickness is unnatural. There is but one natural, normal, and unavoidable form of death,—that by old age: the ripe apple drops from the tree some autumn night, falling in its time. Few men understand how much we lose by neglect of the natural laws of the body,—which are the commandments of the Infinite God,—“lively oracles” writ in these “living stones.” Look at these facts. In 1855 there were about 1,132,000 people in our goodly State,—550,000 males, 582,000 females. Look at this table.

TABLE XXI. — *Of the Age of the People.*

Under 5.	5 to 10.	10 to 15.	15 to 20.	20 to 30.	30 to 40.	
132,944	115,862	110,098	117,047	235,678	165,046	
40 to 50.	50 to 60.	60 to 70.	70 to 80.	80 to 90.	90 to 100.	Over 100.
111,500	71,829	42,423	20,810	6,138	634	19

To state it in round numbers, 711,000 are under 30, only 421,000 above that moderate age; 248,000 are under 10; 227,000 between 10 and 20; 235,000 between 25 and 30. In other words, out of 100 persons 22 are under 10; 20 are between 10 and 20; 21 between 20 and 30; and only 36 out of the 100 have yet seen their thirtieth birthday. So youthful is the people that every fifth person is a little boy or girl under ten, while only one man in sixteen has seen his sixtieth year. In the whole State there are but 142,453 persons over 50,—a little more than half the number that are under 10!

On a previous page we divided life into three periods,—the Dependent, the Productive, and the Retiring age. The Productive age we put between 15 and 60. If we are a little more sanguine in our estimate, and add ten years to the Productive period, making it extend from 15 to 70, then we shall have about 743,000 in that age. The other 400,000 are dependent. Now and then a bright boy or girl is of considerable “pecuniary value” before 15; now and then a man or woman is so well born and well bred that the period of large usefulness continues till 80, or even 90. The most valuable years of John Quincy Adams’s life were between 70 and 80. Massachusetts has several examples of this handsome age; but they are always exceptional. The productive power of the people—their bodily, intellectual, and moral power—will

depend on the number of men and women in the vigorous age, — say between 25 and 60 or 70.

It appears that 20,734 persons died in Massachusetts in 1856, — that is, about two out of 109. It is not extravagant to suppose that two persons are sick all the time for one that dies; thus 41,468 persons in Massachusetts are continually sick, — that is, 1,132,000 persons endure 41,000 years of sickness in each twelvemonth. If this evil were distributed uniformly over the community, it would give a little more than thirteen days of sickness to each man, woman, and child! How many are continually ailing with one malady or another! what an army of doctors — allopathic, homœopathic, hydro-pathic, sudoripathic, mixopathic, and pneumatopathic — are waging war on disease! what ammunition and medical weapons, terrible to look upon, are stored up in the great arsenals of this humane warfare, this really creative fight, tended by diligent apothecaries! The amount of invalidism is frightful to contemplate.

Look a moment at the consequences of sickness. First, there is the positive pain borne directly by the sick and indirectly by their companions and friends. What a monstrous evil that is! It changes life from a delight to a torment, the natural functions of the body are ill performed, and this frame is found to be not only “wonderfully” made, but also “fearfully.” In their normal state all the senses are inlets of delight; but sickness shuts gladness out from all these five doors of the human house, and fills it full of “shrieks and shapes and sights unholy.”

Taken as a whole, the indirect pain of such as stand and wait, looking on with eyes of sympathy, and folding their unavailing hands, is more than the sick man directly encounters himself. What a vast amount of suffering from this direct and this reflected pain!

Then there is the pecuniary cost of sickness. The man's power of productive industry has gone from him. The mechanic's right hand has lost its cunning now; the faithful mother would, but cannot, care for husband or for child; the great, nice brain of genius is like the soft *encephalon* of the fool. Let us estimate the cost as light as possible. Of the 41,468 peren-

nial sick, suppose that 21,468 are persons whose power of productive industry is worth nothing to the country even in their health,—that they only earn their living; that 10,000 are men who, in health, would each earn \$300 a year more than it costs to feed, clothe, house, comfort, and amuse them, and 10,000 more are women who, if well, would earn \$150 apiece beside their similar keep; then the simple cessation of this industry costs the State \$4,500,000 a year. If we should double these figures, and say \$9,000,000, we think we should still be within the mark. Suppose that it costs but a dollar a day to nurse, diet, and doctor each of these 41,468 invalids,—a quite moderate calculation,—that amounts to \$15,135,820. We may safely say that sickness costs the people of Massachusetts directly \$20,000,000 a year, in these two items alone. In other words, if all the people were healthy except the 20,000 who die, Massachusetts would add \$20,000,000 more to her annual increase of honest wealth,—to her means of use and beauty.

Besides, the effects of sickness on the higher faculties of man are commonly quite baneful. It weakens all the spiritual powers; the mind loses its activity; the quantity of thought is less, the quality poorer; the man of business cannot buy and sell to advantage; the carpenter cannot plan his work or execute his plan; the scholar's genius is vanished into thin air; the diligent wife, careful about many things, is now only troubled about herself; the moral faculty suffers as much as the intellectual; the jaundiced eye sees nothing of its natural color. The sick man's conscience is abnormal as his digestion or appetite; he can take no just view of moral relations; as well might we expect a lame horse to race well and leap a five-barred gate, as ask a sick man to have just intuitions of the eternal right, or a manly will to do it; he would, but how can he? A sick judge, doctor, minister, schoolmaster, editor, politician,—he does harm, and not good. So the affectional and religious talents lose their value, are clipped within the ring, sweated down, and cannot be taken at their former worth. Spite of himself, the sick man becomes selfish,—the best of sick men. It is the order of nature; he should be selfish, then. His body is sick, it tries to get well; all of its natural vigor is directed to that object,—for the material basis of humanity

must be preserved. When a ship at sea encounters a violent storm, leaks badly, is settling in the water, and likely to perish, men cut away the masts, let the costly anchors and unfastened chain-cable go down with the run; the wealthy cargo is cast into the ocean, that they may save the ship and their own lives! So in the storm of sickness, long continued, nature instinctively throws overboard all the costly spiritual freight gathered in a lifetime. The

“eye whose bend did awe the world
Doth lose its lustre.”

The world's great warrior cries :

“Give me some drink, Titinius,
As a sick girl.”

There is little exercise of the higher religious faculty; none of that aspiration to the seventh heaven of human devotion: no psalm of lofty gratitude, no deep contritions then; at most, only a dull and humble, passive trust in God. Even that often fails. The affections are often blunted. In health how manly was this man's philanthropy! now, disarmed, it does not travel forth to look after the far-off heathen, the nearer slave, — or black or white, — the poor, the friendless, or the sick. Nay, the mother, tormented with her own pains, — prophetic now of only death, — forgets the very children that she bore; much more does the less affectionate man forget the wife he loved, and the dear babies who climbed his knee and pulled his healthy beard! Blame them not; the sick has only strength to keep his own soul and body together. All the river of life must then go to turn his own mill. We know well this is not what ministers preach in books, and write in many a romantic tale. But we too have seen much of life, and stood at many a death-bed, — beside noble men whom sickness did yet all unman. Have we not our own experience also? Lamé feet must halt, and sick eyes will drop their lids instinctive, and turn from the dear beauty of the rising sun. Humanity lies low in the hand of sickness. Still more commonly is the temper made sour by long-continued illness. If “a hungry man is an angry man,” so is a sick man a peevish one, easily offended, not capable of controlling his wrathful emotions. A schoolmaster with the toothache, a judge with the gout, a bil-

ious doctor, a dyspeptic minister, a sick horse, a dog with a wounded leg,—we all know what these are. This ill-temper is a natural defence. If the arm be broke, the skin, the flesh, the bone itself, else so unfeeling, all become exquisitely sensitive, so that pain may warn us against all things which would annoy and prevent the restoration of the limb. Irritability and peevishness perform the same function; they must guard and keep watch about the sick man's bed, these testy sentinels that so pace forth their nightly round. We have often wondered at the economy of Divine Providence in the healthy body,—not less also thereat in this body when sick.

All the higher faculties are disturbed. The will is weak and capricious, or else its resolution, adherence to conviction, is metamorphosed into obstinacy, persistence is a subjective whim; the judgment is worth little; the opinions represent nothing truly,—so warped is the intellectual mirror. What the sick scholar writes is as unwholesome as he is unhealthy,—it is tainted literature; one might as well eat the flesh of diseased swine, as feed on the literature of sick moralists, historians, preachers, philosophers, poets. The delicate-minded reader feels the author's pulse in his writings. This literary woman has a disease in her spine; all her works, likewise, are tainted and unhealthy. We taste the aloes in many a bitter sermon and bitterer prayer which we have heard. We smell the opium and the gin in much which passes for the literature of passion. Many a dark ecclesiastical dogma about man and God has had its inspiration in a diseased liver or obstructed bowels. Such things are seldom originated by a great, stout, hearty man, who has a wife and babies at home, and takes a manly relish in meat and drink,—who can run and jump, and skate on ice, and swim in water, his eyes open for the cowslip and the violet of spring! No, they are the work of celibate monks, of sick-bodied ministers breathing the bad air of cells or libraries, their feet cold, their head hot, their whole body in disorder. As poison toadstools grow out of rotten wood, so do the worser fungi of an evil theology shoot out from the mind of diseased ministers. He that has a bitter tongue is not likely to say sweet things of man or God: In matters of pure science it is of no consequence who does the work; all

rests on demonstration, deductive from a principle or inductive from facts; Hamilton's Quaternions and Loomis's Astronomy would be worth as much if writ by a sick as a sound man. A man with a dropsy may calculate the trajectory of the last comet, or tell the weight of the fifty-first asteroid: sickness does not vitiate the mathematical demonstration. The nine digits take no man's disease, however infectious: an asymptote has no sympathy with a diseased stomach. But in all works of a moral or religious character the value is personal, not demonstrational; it depends on the character of the writer, and that, at least for the time, depends on his health. What if we were told that Jeremiah had the dyspepsia when he wrote his "Lamentations"; that Jonathan Edwards was laboring with the jaundice when he composed those ghastly sermons on eternal damnation!

Of course we know the exceptions to all this. There are men, and still oftener women, with such sweetness or truth, that the more sickness wilts their roses, the more will they give their precious sweetness out. We know also the function which sickness has to perform in calling forth the sympathy of man for man.

We intended to say a word on the causes of ill health, yet must forbear; but shall instead ask our readers to attend to this extract from a document written by one of the most intelligent men in the State.

"In order to preserve the freshness and health of the body, we must observe the law which commands constant and rapid change of its integral particles. We die daily, whether we will or no. But the extent to which we are *born* again daily, depends much upon ourselves. The component particles of the body have but an ephemeral existence. Hundreds of generations of them go to make up our individual life. Multitudes of them are dying every hour and every moment; and fresh particles are constantly formed to replace them.

"But this incoming multitude cannot have room and verge enough except the worn-out and effete particles are thrown off. Away, then, with the dead, to make room for the living! is the law; and fortunately we cannot disobey it totally, because part of the work is done independently of our volition, and disobedience to it would be death to the whole body. The removal is effected, that is, the waste particles are carried off, by various and complex organs of respiration, perspiration, and the like; but the pervading characteristic of all is motion.

"The automatic motions remove only part of the effete atoms of the body. Voluntary motion must do the rest, or they remain and clog the system. If people were fully aware of this, how much more briskly would they move about to get quickly rid of this dead matter. But how frantically would they fly about, if, instead of carrying the effete particles of their own bodies, each one was obliged to carry, as a burden, the dead particles of some other person. They would die of horror and disgust. As it is, however, very few are conscious of this operation; and thousands in civilized life carry about with sweet complacency their own dead atoms, mixed up with the living ones. They grow feebler and feebler as the proportion of effete matter grows greater, and that of fresh, living matter less, until at last partial death becomes total death.

"Now, so long as the dead and effete particles are carried off by the various excretions just as rapidly as new and fresh ones are formed by wholesome nutrition, so long are we young and fresh. During the first third of life the vital force is very great, and though the supply through nutrition must exceed waste, in order that there may be growth and consolidation of the body, still the waste is very rapid also. New particles rush in swiftly, cast out the dead ones vigorously and utterly, so that the bodies of the young are fresh and alive all over. The swift-moving machinery of life throws the blood out to every part of the surface, and tinges the firm, elastic flesh with roseate hue. As long as this condition lasts, youth lasts, be the number of years what they may.

"The duration of youth depends upon obedience or disobedience of the laws of life. All excesses shorten it. Too much and too little work of brain and limb curtail it. It is shorter in women than in men, mainly because their blood is not duly oxygenated by exercise or work in the open air. It is usually much shorter in the blind than in those who see. In a class of a hundred blind youths there are very few who have the beautiful characteristics of this period of life,—the roseate hue, the rounded limb, the bounding step; and even among those few these beauties fade away earlier than among others.

"Exercise, too, being pretty much under his volition, is apt to be neglected, and so the waste and effete particles are not duly carried off. At first they linger a little in the system; then they linger longer. There now begin to be dead and effete particles among the living ones, and the system begins to be a little clogged thereby. From this moment real manhood declines, and real age begins, be the years of life ever so few.

"The spring of life having lost a little of its force, the blood is no

longer thrown vigorously out to the periphery of the body; it therefore crowds the great internal vessels, and prepares the way for congestion and organic diseases. The surface becomes a little pale. The flesh loses its elasticity. It looks puttyish and feels flabby. Freshness is now gone, and with it beauty. Adieu youth, adieu manhood; age is here.

"This change is seen sooner in women than in men. Sooner in the blind than in others. Most women in this country are as old at thirty or thirty-five, as they should be at forty-five or fifty. Suppose the years lost by each one to be only ten, what millions of years of bloom and beauty and vigor are lost to each generation! But how can we calculate the billions of years lost to the next generation by reason of the diminished stock of vital force imparted to the offspring!"*

VII. *Of the Means for the Education of the People.*†

1. Of the Common and High Schools. — There are 4,360 public schools in Massachusetts, open to all, free to all persons, native or foreign, African or Caucasian, rich or poor. There are 4,838 teachers, — a noble army of schoolmasters. In the summer 195,881 pupils attended the schools; 203,031 in the winter. The schools keep on the average seven months and a half in the year. The average attendance of pupils is 177,775. There are in Massachusetts 221,478 children between the ages of five and fifteen. All the large towns save one have public high schools, where girls as well as boys can receive a superior education. Boston is the only exception. Here the controlling men secure the monopoly of superior education for the daughters of the rich.

2. Of the Normal Schools. — Four Normal Schools, public and free to all, contain 345 pupils, 290 of them young women, all preparing to become teachers. These institutions have already received 3,434 pupils, of whom 1,937 graduated at the end of the course of study.

3. Of Private Schools and Academies. — There are 744 of these institutions, containing about 24,000 pupils. Here the cost is paid by the parents of the scholars.

4. Of the Colleges. — There are five Colleges, — four Protestant and one Catholic, — containing about 1,100 students, all

* Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind.

† Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education, &c. Boston. 1858.

males. The schools for law, medicine, theology, and science are attended by about 500 pupils. There is no college for young women; but yet one medical school is for them exclusively.

Thus it appears that about 230,000 young persons received instruction in the various schools of the State in 1857; one fifth part of the whole population went to school.

5. Besides, the State has two Industrial Schools, one for boys, one for girls.

(1.) In the Reform School for Boys* at Westborough there were 613 pupils on the 30th of last September. Three fourths are Americans; they are sent there by the courts, and average about 13 years of age. We are sorry to say we cannot speak very well of the plan or the influence of this school.

(2.) In the Industrial School for Girls at Lancaster† there were 92. Their average age is about 14. A few years ago private benevolence established a little institution, called "The Guardian for Friendless Girls," in Boston; it did much good work in the two years of its existence. Then the State took the matter in charge, and now reaches out a parental hand to these poor wretches, snatching them from a fate worse than the compulsory doom of the negro slave. It is one of the most significant and valuable charities of the Commonwealth, one of its most righteous acts of justice. There is no conscious antagonism between man and woman: on the whole, men are more tender to women than to each other. Women reciprocate the gentle feeling. Such is the law of nature. Female nurses indulge the male babies; were the nurses men, the girls would get the kinder treatment. But in our civilization hitherto brute force has prevailed, and as woman has less of it than man, only the inferior position has been hers in the state, the church, the community, and the market. Even now she is by no means thought the equivalent of man. Accordingly, most cruel hardships fall to her lot. One day this will be changed. The terrible vice of

* Eleventh Annual Report of the Trustees of the State Reform School at Westborough, &c. Boston. 1857.

† Second Annual Report of the Trustees of the State Industrial School for Girls at Lancaster, &c. Boston. 1857.

prostitution, — what a curse it is! In the future it will be as rare as leprosy and elephantiasis are now in Boston. But this will never be until the popular idea of woman undergoes a revolution. It was a great thing for Massachusetts to stretch out her arm to rescue these poor girls and save them from the Dead Sea which covers a whole Sodom and Gomorrah of wickedness! The institution seems well planned, and thus far works well.

VIII. *Of the Means for repressing Crime.*

1. Of Jails and Houses of Correction.* — In the eleven months ending September 30, 1857, there were 13,072 persons committed to the various common jails and houses of correction in Massachusetts. We put the details into the following table.

TABLE XXII. — *Punishment for Crime.*

Number.	Foreigners.	Natives.	Males.	Females.
13,072	8,334	4,738	10,649	2,423
For Intemperance.	All other Crimes.	Addicted to habitual Intemperance.	Not addicted to habitual Intemperance.	
5,445!	7,627	7,706!	5,366	

But of this number of "criminals," 491 were witnesses, kept in jail according to an ungodly custom which has become a law. 4,853 of the actual criminals were unable to read and write. The average number of prisoners on each day of the year was 1,733; but 1,876 were in jail on the 30th of last September; 3,358 had been in jail before.

2. Of the State Prison.† — On the 30th of September this institution contained 440 convicts. 279 native Americans, 154 foreigners. Massachusetts sends to her own State Prison nearly as many criminals as all foreign nations put together. The great crimes which are punished there are not committed by Irishmen, but by our own citizens. 349 men were there for crimes against property, only 91 for offences against the person, — crimes of wrath or lust. It is pleasant to see that with the advance of civilization crime is diverted from

* Abstract of Returns of the Keepers of Jails, and of the Overseers of the Houses of Correction, for the Eleven Months ending September 30, 1857. Boston. 1857.

† Annual Report of the Board of Inspectors of the Massachusetts State Prison, October 1, 1857. Boston. 1857.

the substance of man to his accidents. The health of the convicts seems well cared for; few prisons in the world exhibit so small a mortality. There were but 4 deaths out of 440 persons! This is at the rate of 90 in 10,000. Now the rural population of England, at the adult age, lose 77 out of 10,000, the town population of Manchester 124 out of 10,000, and the British soldiers in barracks at home from 110 to 204 in 10,000. We wish we could say some other good things of the State Prison.

3. Of the Gallows. — During the last year the State did not stain her hands with the blood of a murdered murderer: 101 killed themselves, but Massachusetts killed no man nor woman. We trust the days of the gallows are ended.

On the whole, this is a gratifying result; the experiment of self-government works well; this is a great success in respect to numbers, health, property, intelligence, morality. Out of New England it will not be easy to find a million and a quarter of people living so comfortably, with such industry and wealth, such comfort, intelligence, and manly virtue. Yet there are still great evils to be overcome. See how the good and ill gets summed up in Boston. On this little spot, — more than half of it made land, rescued from the sea, — to speak in round numbers, there are 161,000 persons, — 76,000 native Americans, 85,000 foreigners: such are the figures for 1855. 2,500 couples were married in 1856, — 1,500 foreign, 1,000 American. 5,900 were born here that year, — 4,500 of foreign, 1,400 of native parents. There were 4,200 deaths, at the average age of but 20.

The taxable property in 1857 was \$ 258,000,000. 2,500 persons entered the almshouses, yet only 670 were there on the average. The pauperism of Boston is small compared with the whole population; 670 permanent paupers out of 161,000 inhabitants, 85,000 of them Irish, is not alarming. Besides, it should be remembered that poverty has driven great shoals of poor people to this town within a dozen years.

There are 267 public schools: last year they took more than 26,000 pupils into their hospitable arms; over 22,000 are there learning all the time; for the blessed doors stand open all the day to the children of all nations, all forms of religion, of any

race. With universal justice do our democratic institutions distribute the great charity of education to all. Private bounty opens evening schools also, for children of a larger growth, who are yet babies in knowledge. The dead hand of Mr. Lowell reaches out of his grave, and opens the door of science and letters to thousands of thoughtful men and women.

The amount of crime looks formidable at first, but it is not alarming for a great town so crowded with Irish Catholics and other strangers. 270 quiet-looking policemen keep the peace of the city; the sun never goes down on their watchful work. Four detectives are on the look-out for suspicious persons. In 1857, 19,000 arrests were made, 9,000 commitments. Of the 19,000, 15,000 were foreigners, 4,000 Americans; 4,300 women. Of the 19,000, 10,000 were for drunkenness, less than 9,000 for all other offences! One was punished for violating the liquor law! As there are 2,230 places where intoxicating spirit is sold to be drunk on the premises, it is only fair to infer that this man was a sinner above all that dwelt in the other 2,229 liquor-shops! The amount of property reported as stolen was only \$ 62,000, and of that \$ 48,000 was recovered by the police and restored to its lawful owners. Hence it seems that *this* brotherhood of thieves does but a small business; and as they don't keep quite a shilling where they steal three and ninepence, it seems the profit is but little in comparison to the risk. We hardly think this branch of the trade is a "living business," certainly it is organized but ill. Of course our figures do not include the thefts committed by fraudulent merchants, bankers, and officers of incorporated companies, who belong to the same brotherhood of thieves, but do only the heavy stealing.

It is a singular mixture of good and evil,—267 public schools, 245 public houses of ill-fame, 22,000 children daily in school, 2,200 tippling-shops open all day, 10,000 men and women yearly taken up for public drunkenness!*

After all, it is a good town, this dear old Puritanic Boston.

* See the Annual Report of the Chief of Police, 1858. City Document No. 5. He says (p. 28): "It is an admitted fact, that intemperance is the direct origin of more poverty, more crime, and consequent suffering, than all other causes combined."

We wish we may be mistaken, but yet we think it the best city in the world, — the most moral, intelligent, charitable, and progressive, — the most hospitable to a great, new truth of philosophy, morals, philanthropy, or religion. We hope there are better towns, but know not where to find them.

At the end of this long paper we wish to make a few suggestions, which may serve as moral to the tale.

1. Our New England institutions have been subjected to a very severe test. They were designed for Protestant Americans, — men educated to freedom, with Teutonic blood in their veins. What if none else had come here in this century? We should have been a quite different people, with much less wealth, — for the Irish labor has been a great industrial force, perhaps as valuable as the water-power of the mills on the Connecticut or the Merrimac. Our social development we think would be far in advance of its present condition. But causes which none foresaw brought foreigners here by the thousand, — men of a different nationality, chiefly Celtic people, nay, Irish, foreign in origin, manners, religion, ethnological disposition. What made it worse, they had vices which centuries of oppression fixed on these outcasts. They were poor and servile. Want, ignorance, oppression, the greatest evils which retard civilization, had bound them with a three-fold chain. The Irish had the vices of their condition, wretchedness, beggary, drunkenness, deceit, lying, violence, treachery, malice, superstition; they brought with them the most bigoted priesthood in all Christendom. What should be done? Some men said: "Shut them out from all our political institutions. Let them be with us, not of us. Democracy is for native Americans, not foreign Catholic Irish." But wiser counsels prevailed. After a few years, the foreigner who wills becomes a citizen. No property qualification is required, only an educational qualification. If he can read his neck-verse and write his name, he claims benefit of clergy, becomes a citizen in full, eligible to any office except the one he could not fill worse than it has been. The advent of a quarter of a million foreigners — 200,000 of these Irishmen — has been a sore trial to our democratic institutions. No war would be so severe a test. They have stood it well. No doubt the

presence of such a people has the same effect for a time on our civilization which it has on the parts of the town where they settle. Dirt and rum, with pestilence and blows, follow their steps; their votes already have debauched the politics of the city, which they will degrade yet more in the next ten or twenty years. They have bad advisers of their own and of our own. Not an Irish newspaper in America is on the side of humanity, education, freedom, progress.

Yet this evil is but temporary; like the malaria which follows draining a swamp, or flowing a meadow, or opening a canal. Our institutions will correct most of the ills we complain of, — our industry, our schools, newspapers, books, and freedom of thought. The Irish have many excellent qualities; the women are singularly virtuous, the men full of fun, wit, and joyous good-humor. They accumulate property; escaping from want little by little. Ignorance will disappear, and then the oppression of the priest will also soon end. The next generation of Irish will be quite unlike this. The Catholic Church will not change; none escape the consequence of a first principle. The logic of its despotic idea is the manifest destiny of the Roman Church. In this age none enters that cave of Triptolemus but he loses his manhood; the first step costs that. Mr. Brownson is the most distinguished Catholic in America, a man of very large intellectual talents, great power of acquisition, and the facile art to reproduce in distinct and attractive forms. He is powerful in speech, as with the pen, having also an industry which nothing daunts, or even tires. But compare the Democratic Brownson, fighting — (his life was always a battle, is, and will be) — fighting for liberty, for man and woman, with the Catholic Brownson, the “Saint Orestes” of some future mythology!

“*Tantum Religio potuit suadere malorum.*”

The Catholic Church will not change, — cannot change; its future, like its past,

“*Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans.*”

But it may die; of this we are sure, it cannot stand against the free school, the free press, the free pulpit, the open vote of all the people. When the Irishmen escape from their two

worst enemies, — their priests and our demagogues, — we shall see a noble harvest of men ripening under the great sun of Democracy.

2. The New-Englanders set too little value on physical health. They do not prize a strong body. Men in cities always decay in vigor; they are smaller in size, feebler in strength. The average age at death, in Boston, is not quite 20. In Dukes County it is over 45. So 20 men in Dukes County will live 900 years; in Boston, only 400! There is a great odds in the healthiness of towns. In Lowell 21 die out of 1,000 each year; in Boston, 24; in Baltimore, 25; in Philadelphia, 26; in Savannah, 41; in New Orleans, 81! Out of 1,000 men at New Orleans, 60 more will die in a year than at Lowell. There is a similar odds in different parts of this city.* Men take little notice of these things, and try to live where they are sure to die. They attend much to money, little to man, and so, in getting the means of living, they lose life itself. Farmers die at 64; shoemakers at 43; printers at 36. So 36 farmers will live as long as 43 shoemakers, or 64 printers. Why? The farmer breathes air; the shoemaker, wax and leather; the printer, ink and type-metal.† In schools great stress is laid on training the mind, — always the mind, nothing but the mind. The most excessive stimulants are applied to make little girls learn the maximum of books in the minimum of time. We forget that God also made the body, and, if this "earthen vessel" be cracked, that all the spiritual "treasure" runs out, and perishes from the earth. For success in life there is needed a good brain and a good body. One is worth little without the other. What God hath joined, we are everlastingly putting asunder. But most of the eminent men in America have tough bodies; what power of work is in them! Look at the rich merchants, at our great lawyers and judges,

* See Dr. Curtis's valuable Report on the Census of Boston, for 1855, (Boston, 1856,) p. 55 *et seq.*

† On the influence of improper food and bad air to shorten life, see the admirable work which we must thank Miss Florence Nightingale for calling out, — *Mortality of the British Army, at Home and Abroad, and during the Russian War, as compared with the Mortality of the Civil Population in England. Illustrated by Tables and Diagrams.* London. 1858. Folio (pamphlet). See, too, the Sanitary Report of Massachusetts, pp. 143 *et seq.*, 158, 36, 249, *et al.*

men of science, politics, letters. They are men of vigorous health, who can eat dinners, and sleep o' nights, and work also days long; they live to a decent and respectable age. A venerable doctor of medicine, more than 80 years old, may be seen every day in Boston walking his rounds, at that great age manfully representing not only the science, but also the charity, of that healing art he has done so much to improve as well as to apply: we never look at Dr. James Jackson without reverent thankfulness for the wise and temperate vigor which has kept him useful so long. Mr. Quincy has a national reputation, not only for integrity, which never forsook him in times of trial, but also for that strength of body which holds nobly out in his eighty-seventh year. The happy old age of these two venerable and well-known men is due to their inheritance less than to their active, regular, and temperate habits; because wise, their life is also long.

The fashionable idea of what a woman should be is nearly as pernicious as the theological conception of what God is, —almost as unnatural. She must be as feeble as a ghost. Hardly can she bear the burden of her ill-supported clothes. Steady and continuous toil is impossible to such a doll. She glories in her shame, and is as proud of weakness as Hercules and Samson are supposed to have been of their legs and great burly shoulders. But we doubt if it be natural that a "cultivated woman" should be a cross betwixt a ghost and a London doll. Charlemagne's daughter, on her shoulders carrying home her lover through the treacherous and newly fallen snow, is a little nearer the natural type of the animal woman. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," though reported as a curse for man alone, is a blessing which the Infinite pronounces also on woman; the second benediction recorded in Genesis.

A certain amount of work is necessary to keep the body sound. Our life is the dying of old particles, and their replacement by new ones. Part of the effete matter must be got rid of by perspiration, through the pores of the skin. The natural work of earning food, shelter, raiment, is also the natural means for health. If this be not done, there is an accumulation of dead matter, — and the delicate woman, too proud to

cook her dinner or wash her clothes, at length comes to this vile drudgery,—the menial work of dragging about all day a piece of “a slovenly, unhandsome corse.” Heaven save us from the righteous sentence to such hard labor for life! No court of doctors can reverse the decision of that Infinite Chief Justice whose law is the constitution of the universe. Let us suppose an average New England woman at her marriageable age weighs 120 pounds; and a man 140 pounds. Suppose two idle lovers of this bulk have so lived that ten per cent of their bodies is thus effete,—dead, but not buried. When they stand up and join hands in wedlock, there is a marriage of 234 pounds of live man and woman, and also of 26 pounds of male and female corpse! We know a family where one mother bore fourteen children,—none of them died under 75 years of age. A woman who bears, breeds, and brings up a dozen, or half that number, of healthy, hardy, and long-lived sons and daughters, so far as that goes, is a mother worth being proud of. Had such a generation of women as now fill up our great towns lived in New England a hundred years ago, the Revolution would have been impossible. Puny women may become dry nurses to a coward, not mothers to great, brave, burly-bodied men. If we look into the church registers of the country towns for the last one hundred and fifty years, we find from eight to twelve births to a marriage. The children grew up, the parents did not think “a large family is a great curse”! We know a man whose six male ancestors, now sleeping in New England soil, will average about seventy-seven years; while the six female come up to about eighty. The first and the last of these women each bore her eleven children,—one of them had but seven, and she became a widow at forty,—and one had fourteen.

In Boston, this year, 5,800 will be born; of these more than 1,000 will die before the 1st of January, 1859. Part of this monstrous mortality will come from bad management, bad air, bad food,—from poverty;—want still prowls about the cradle and clutches at the baby’s throat,—this ugly hyena of civilization;—but much of it also from the lack of vitality in the mother. Yet more of it, from the bad habits of men, debauched by intemperance of various kinds, visiting the

iniquity of the father upon the children, to the third and fourth generation!

It is rather a puny set of men who grow up in our great towns, — spindle-legged, ("without visible means of support,") — ashamed of their bodies (not wholly without reason), yet pampering them with luxuries. We have left off manly games, to our hurt; but it was refreshing to see men and women rejoice in skates last winter. The members of engine companies are the only men who can go faster than a walk; but for the frequent fires we fear running would become one of the "Lost Arts." Military trainings are getting out of fashion, for war is deservedly hateful; and the intemperance which has always been the attendant, if not of military, at least of militia glory, has made the public a little fearful of that common sort of manly pastime. Our few soldiers have fine uniforms, they march well, — on a smooth road, a mile at a time, — and perform their evolutions with the precision of clock-work; — such regular uniformity we have never seen in the armies of France, Austria, or Prussia, or even England. But the city soldiers lack bodily power. In the time of Shays's rebellion, in the winter of 1786-7, a company of Boston light infantry had twelve hours' notice that they must march to Springfield. They started at daylight next morning, — there were about ninety in rank and file. We had the story from one of them, a young carpenter then, — an old merchant when he told the tale. Each man had his weapons, his blanket, and three days' provision on his back. By the road-side they ate their rough, cold dinner at Framingham, twenty-six miles off; they slept at Worcester, eighteen miles further on. The next day it stormed, and through snow eight inches deep they marched forty-six miles more. They stopped their music — only a fife and drum — ten miles from their journey's end, and when at eight o'clock in the evening they wheeled into Springfield, the solid tread of the men was the first tidings the insurgents got that the troops had left Boston! If the "Tigers" of 1858 were to march ninety miles in two days, there would be nothing left of them — but a bear-skin!

3. Drunkenness is still a monstrous evil. Of the 25,000 persons aided by public municipal charity last year, 15,000

were brought to poverty by drunkenness; of the 13,000 more in the jails, 8,000 were "addicted to habitual intemperance"; 23,000 victims in almshouses or jails. Mother of want, ignorance, and crime, drunkenness is also mother of the madman and the fool. She has her head-quarters in Boston, where 2,200 dram-shops are on tap all the year! 10,000 men arrested for drunkenness! Shall we wonder that babies die,—1,000 in their first year? Drunkenness is a male vice; but the cruellest sufferings thereof come on the unoffending mother, daughter, sister, wife!*

One other vice, the crime against woman, leaves its ghastly stain in all our great towns. This will not end till there is a revolution in the popular idea of woman. Then it will pass off, as other vices yet more monstrous and unnatural have vanished away before the rising sun of knowledge which bears healing on its wings.

The evils we have mentioned — crime, drunkenness, prostitution, such poverty in the midst of such wealth — show clearly enough how ill the social forces of the people are organized as yet. Natural rights are only to be had on condition man performs his natural duties. In America we have organized the State for political purposes better than the community for the social development of the individual. But take Massachusetts as she is, much has been done to overcome our three great enemies, — want, ignorance, oppression. Much more is now doing for the higher development of the noblest faculties of man. How much yet remains to be done! It is safe to say there are means now within the reach of this State, whereby in a few generations the average age of the people might be doubled, and one man then live as long as two live now. If a man sow death, he reaps it; if life, of such also is the harvest. We can abolish drunkenness, — not all at once, not by violence, but by the gradual elevation of the people. Then what an increase there will be of plenty, knowledge, cleanliness, and peace. How much will crime be diminished and life lengthened out in beauty!

* See some most important remarks on the effects of intoxicating liquors in Drs. Bucknill and Tuke's *Manual of Psychological Medicine*, (London, 1858,) pp. 44, 366, *et al.*

In common with all mankind, we have made one great mistake: we have thought education was to be mainly of the intellect, understanding, imagination, reason. So we omit the moral and affectional faculties,—the power to know right and to do right,—the power to love a few, many, or all men. We cultivate the religious powers more poorly than any other,—tying a man down with a theology which debases his nature, makes him a coward and a slave. This great river of God runs to waste. One day we shall correct all this. Great ideas of science, justice, and love shall be the creed of a people who know and love the Infinite Father of all mankind. Already we have a church without a bishop, a state without a king, a community without a lord, a family with no holder of slaves. One day we shall have also a community without idleness, want, ignorance, drunkenness, prostitution, or crime, wherein all men and women who are by nature fit shall be naturally wed, children be born according to nature, grow up healthy, and die manly of old age. What is not behind us is before, and the future will be brighter than the past.

ART. III.—THE COMPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

1. *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis Exegeticus et Criticus.* Auctore GEORGIO HENRICO AUGUSTO EWALD. Lipsiæ. 1828.
2. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannis oder Allgemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannis insbesondere.* Von DR. FRIEDRICH LÜCKE. Bonn. 1852.
3. *Kurze Erklärung der Offenbarung Johannis.* Von DR. W. M. L. DE WETTE. Leipzig. 1848.

OUR aim in what follows is not to add another to the many interpretations of the allegory which closes the canon of the New Testament, nor yet to discuss those already propounded, but to offer some suggestions illustrative of the psychological and rhetorical principles which lie at the foundation of that remarkable composition.

Every system of religion, philosophy, or politics describes itself to its disciples by its aspirations. In the projected Western city, — projected into forests and swamps, — no detail is omitted on the map for complete effect. All the streets cross each other at right angles; they are all broad avenues overshadowed with trees, *full-grown*; there are schools, theatres, and temples at every corner, grottos and groves and fountains in every square, and all the advantages and amenities of an ancient city. The descriptive advertisements are after the style of the New Jerusalem. A friend sent us the other day a Report of a Western railroad, containing a map of lands for sale. He had never seen them; but in a fertile and pleasant section he had drawn with a colored pencil a circle, and at the foot of the page, in striking and brilliant capitals, was written, "*Utopia*"! His plan was Utopian and romantic: there, with a few friends, to found a new society; to cultivate the earth a little, — poetry, life, thought, love, a great deal. This dream came to him while oppressed by poverty and misfortune in one of the most vicious cities of the world; it was his protest and present solace. The imagination constructs a new world in which all our ideals shall be realized, all our aspirations and dreams. We wish at least a perfect idea towards which to tend. The appeal is to a future, near or distant, where every prophet, poet, and reformer may find refuge. We eke out the mean present with the golden future. The form which this idea takes is poetical, and requires the license of the poet's art. History conceals in itself intimations of a more perfect order, of a more perfect state. The prophet gathers up these fragments, — these precious stones built into the mud-walls of the world, — and, combining them with his own wonderful visions, produces the Millennium, the Saturnian or Golden Age, the Model Republic, Utopia, the New Atlantis, the New Jerusalem. All activity is prospective, and prophetic of some such goal. The bamboo blossoms, and then dies. The scholar, the soldier, the sailor, the merchant, all anticipate ease, honor, and content. Each cherishes in his heart some private New Jerusalem.

But while there is anything to know or to do, while the truth which we see is unaccepted, while falsity and injustice

are still sovereign, we are restless and unsatisfied. An artist described this state to us one summer evening by the sea, — that symbol of unrest. He said: "I would rest. I would be as composed, as serene, as are now the skies and the silent earth. I would be as patient, as confident as Lyra, waiting above there thirteen thousand years to become the Pole Star. But I am uneasy until what wants doing gets itself done. I rest when I find something greatly and perfectly done in art, or poetry, or society, and am satisfied. This feeling it is which pervades me on a perfect June or October day, and takes away all activity. And with Nature alone do I feel content. There is, indeed, something like it before a faultless statue or temple. While I retain this joy and satisfaction, I come into the presence of the imperfect and chaotic with dread and excitement. My heart prophesies what forms of beauty underlie marble and language and all the elements; and the right hand longs to exercise its cunning. Materials, plastic and inviting, lie ready for the creative word. I know how sweet is repose, and the golden age of man; but I must perfect my life and my art before I dare to rest. I stand receptive before Nature and my masters; but I am inflamed and tormented when I come into the wide, unconquered realms where my companions are, — some listless, some in despair, some self-satisfied. Although I see that some things are impracticable now, I cannot flatter false institutions by thinking them permanent, but, looking steadily to the end, must say, these are temporary, and to be hated and supplanted." He paused; the surf, rising a little higher than usual, obliterated all our footprints in the sand. We stepped on, making fresh ones. "The waves are restless, — every moment they are taking new shapes. I would not fix even the most beautiful forms of the curling spray, for thus I prevent the possibility of still more beautiful. The mountains seem composed. Would any one suppose they were once waves, and moved and flowed? Time has made them rigid and still. Only the clouds and the sun give them a kind of apparent motion. But the ocean is the emblem of man's heart."

Thus he spoke, expressing as nearly as might be his

thought, but conscious that he had not quite expressed it. The thought is nearly related to that which seems to be the essence of prophecy and of John's vision, — dissatisfaction with the present, and aspiration after perfection and rest. There are some things which lie too deep for literal speech, and drive us to take refuge in symbol, or in some private cipher. The greater the conception, the more incomplete is always the execution. So much is opened, so much is left unsaid and undone, so much is left to the imagination, so much to presumed affinity with the creating spirit. The blunder men make in interpretation is that they do not read in the same spirit which created, but in another. To explain in detail the Apocalypse is now an easy matter. To explain its rhetoric, its æsthetic, is simple. If one wishes to understand its allusions and figures, the helps are abundant in every commentary. These things we shall not attempt, but presuppose. The true interpreter is he who masters his materials, and then, advancing beyond them, adds, if he may be so happy, something of his own. His own nature, if he be a thorough and sympathetic student, will furnish its proper addition to every subject. To understand the Apocalypse, we must get at that which underlies the Apocalypse, — that which if we could reach would rewrite it. It is impossible to understand a symbol without the help of another. This is what our artist felt when he attempted to explain that condition of the soul which precedes and follows the embodiment and realization of an ideal. There must rise in the mind some corresponding image. Plotinus said: "The eye that is not solar cannot see the sun." We must strive for the same, or some kindred perception. Complete culture would enable us to rise through all the spheres of vision, until every obscurity successively vanishes. We ought not to expect poetry to be translated into our vernacular. And the Apocalypse is a symbolical epopee, often grotesque and fantastic, and there is no guide but an appreciation of the vision which possessed the soul of the Prophet. It does not end in the Christian Church, in the Catholic, in plagues, wars, and famine, in ancient or modern events. History, with its iron pen, might record these without a flourish. The child

understands it best whose imagination is inflamed by its strange images, and dreams of them at night, and sees them always in the sky. Already they have a meaning to him, and slowly, unless his impressions be interfered with, he will grow into a full perception of their significance. It may seem fantastic, but we know a person now in the prime of years and wisdom, who, when a child, hurried through and often neglected his school lessons in order to steal time to read in the Book of Revelation. The Book is for such. It is not for all. Why attempt to popularize it? Why not admit that the spirit which produced it alone can rightly comprehend it? Leave Paul his doctrines and John his visions. Until we can distinguish a symbol from a syllogism, we had better stick to Paul. Let no one imagine that, because the book is in the Bible, he must read it, and believe it somehow; that he must find doctrine and religion and Jesus Christ in it. The ancient Hebrews had sense enough to put history, stories, mythology, and exotics into their Bible. Although a more frigid taste controlled the selection of the new Scriptures, this last burst of the old Hebrew Muse did somehow find its way into it, and forms the fitting close to that magnificent anthology of wisdom and eloquence,—the Bible. But, differing as it does in style, character, and design from the rest of the New Testament, it is to be read differently. He would come to it best prepared who should carefully read the older and the later prophets, who should become familiar with their vaticinations of a golden age of the Messianic world, with Jerusalem for its metropolis, and, omitting most of the New Testament, pass directly to this book. Here that which had been hinted at and sketched in outline is filled up and completed. Ancient and scattered materials are collected, and unity and form imparted to them. A new value and meaning has been given to them by the new religion, and the poet, experiencing an impulse thereto in his heart, has, like Shakespeare and Goethe, reclothed an old story and put into it the sentiment of his time and sect. He has taken such liberty as one may with an old story; and art delights to work on old subjects where the imagination is unfettered,—delights to work in that dim region whose vague objects,

arousing the inward vision, disenthral the outward sense. Luther rejected the Apocalypse because he could not find Jesus Christ in it. That being the absorbing idea in his own mind, he looked to see it conspicuously and dogmatically asserted throughout the Bible. He could not see the idea of Jesus and of all the prophets, completed and realized under this symbolism. Luther had not the accommodating, susceptible spirit of Swedenborg. Swedenborg's Commentaries have this value, that they connect every fact with another fact, explain every symbol by another symbol, and give to the most literal, prosaic statements a spiritual significance. "When one is in a spiritual state, nothing is mentioned by name which does not signify some thing or state." "The Isle of Patmos signifies a state and place in which John could be illuminated." This is a doctrine by which all mysteries can be rewritten. Whatever is in the mind, it shall be the formula for all that is external. But it is an arbitrary system, and dangerous when it attempts to guide others. For when a man translates one symbol by another, you must use a third to reach his. You are as far as ever from the original. The symbol must be one's own. The imagination is the most private and individual of the faculties, and is not a safe guide or example for others. It works by suggestion, by impulse, by impression, by the most subtle and rapid flights of the mind; it depends upon temperament, habit, and education. It is a necessity with some natures to connect every idea with a symbol. So poets and artists seek nature, science, facts, history, myths, out of which to construct a body for their thought. Never does a man feel himself so far removed from others, as when the imagination is in exercise. He inhabits another world. Material things figure in his brain as the servants of thought, and he feels an exhilarating sense of freedom and superiority. The true sovereignty of man consists in the exercise of the imagination. The cultivation of this faculty is the nearest way to the right understanding of the Apocalypse. We need that fluent spirit which easily flows into every situation and feeling; which can feel its kindred with men and with nature, and transfer itself to remote times and places; — not a vacant

mind, but intensely sympathetic; — a mind not occupied overmuch with preconceptions and speculations, or the cares and concerns of life; but free, childlike, susceptible, following the movements of another mind as water follows the indentations of the shore.

If these conditions are too exclusive, it must be so. Yet we are not thereby excluded from saving truth. We shall, in the circle of our experiences, become identified with all that it is needful for us to know. The variety of the Bible corresponds to the variety of thought and feeling among men. There is something for every taste, — universal types of character and faith. He who writes himself "Cosmopolite," will some time perhaps reach in his wanderings the Isle of Patmos. He will see John, an old man, an exile, wandering in ecstasy along the sands of the shore. The ocean, with its ebb and flow, with its storm and calm, is the emblem of his soul. He is dreaming of the destruction of those powers whose victim he was, whose victims were all Christians, and of the establishment of the kingdom of God upon the earth speedily. From that barren islet, from those rugged shores, across the *Ægean*, looms the New Jerusalem, with walls of emerald, topaz, jacinth, and amethyst. He sees his own part, his own work therein. These narrow, lonely shores, are not long to confine him. "And he said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples and nations and tongues and kings." Thus he saw, and thus he wrote; and into this drama he put his fears, his hopes, his griefs, and in many dark hours its composition brought him a little solace and repose.

If some able composer should undertake it, he would find it easily translatable into music; and perhaps its best interpreter would be an oratorio. The text of the oratorio is generally dramatic, and here the form is already such. And if ever the divine drama should gain admittance to our theatres again,* this, of right, would be the first selection, and would make as astonishing a spectacle as any of the fairies, goblins, monsters, and hippogriffs which in times past have ruled the stage. Some of its scenes would be terrific enough to delight the intensity of the pit.

* As in the *Miracle Plays*.

Whoever was the author of the Apocalypse, he was a thorough Hebrew, familiar with his native history and literature, deeply read in the prophets, of whom he is an imitator, full of the national ideas and expectations. He designed to paint a future splendid enough to content the Christians in their present sufferings and despair.

He who, cut off from his friends, his work, and his pleasures, sees himself and his cause hated and persecuted, and feels in the midst of his nameless sadness the stirrings of hope, and the certainty of final triumph, has the key to this writing. And when, throwing his activities into the sphere of art, he translates his experience, by the help of imagination, into romance, poetry, and allegory, as Dante, John, and Bunyan have done, the symbols will be found to be of universal import.

Jesus prefigures a perfected humanity; the New Jerusalem is a vision of its accomplishment, with new heavens and new earth for its abode, and must for ever stand as the poetical statement of the aspirations of Christianity.

ART. IV.—CURTIS'S HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION.

History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States; with Notices of its Principal Framers. By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS. In two volumes. Volume II. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1858. 8vo. pp. 653.

ON the publication of the first volume of this work, we took occasion to speak of its merits as a contribution to our historical literature, and bore willing testimony to the thoroughness of the author's researches, and the clearness and vigor of his style.* In these respects his second volume justifies the favorable opinion we then expressed; and with this acknowledgment we return to a discussion which has been interrupted longer than we anticipated. In our remarks on the

* Christian Examiner, Number CLXXXVII., Article V.

first volume, we entered at length upon an examination of some of the principal circumstances which prepared the way for the formation of the Constitution and rendered possible the fusion of the thirteen separate Colonies into one nationality. We design now, in connection with some remarks on the volume before us, to show what were the formative processes through which this result was attained,—by what concessions and compromises the various conflicting interests, theories, and predilections were adjusted, and a permanent government substituted for a temporary league. Before proceeding to deal with these questions, we desire to recur for a moment to a few of the facts which have already been considered, in order that our readers may carry along with them in the further discussion of this subject a clear impression of the actual condition of the country at the meeting of the Convention of 1787.

The Congress which adopted the Declaration of Independence, and carried on the war with the mother country, was a body of very extensive but ill-defined powers. In theory it might seem to possess—as it certainly needed—all the powers of a national government. The authority of Great Britain had been everywhere suppressed, and Congress had assembled before the organization of the State governments was effected. But in practice, it was soon found that these powers could not be exercised successfully, for want of the necessary machinery for acting directly upon the people. Under the Confederation this defect became still more apparent. By the Articles of Confederation, which were adopted by Congress in November, 1777, but not finally ratified by all the States until March, 1781, the powers of Congress were more accurately defined; and though these powers were in some respects sufficiently ample, they were accompanied by reservations and qualifications which greatly hindered their efficient use. The result was that the Confederation proved to be inadequate to the wants of the country, both during the war and in the first years of the peace. It was neither respected at home nor feared abroad; and with each succeeding year, and each new trial of its strength, its deficiencies were more widely acknowledged. Its failure had been fore-

seen by our wisest statesmen, though few were prepared to recommend a better system. But as early as 1780, Hamilton, then a young man of twenty-three, with a marvellous aptitude for political discussion, had pointed out the defects of the existing system, and sketched the plan of a general government in which we may trace the first germ of the Constitution. With his keen and rapid insight into the true principles of representative government, he saw at once the nature of the difficulties under which the country was languishing, and the remedy; and from that time he labored to impress his views upon those having the direction of public affairs. He was so far successful in this endeavor, that the Convention held at Annapolis in September, 1786, of which he was a member, determined to recommend a general Convention of delegates from all the States. They accordingly proposed a Convention at Philadelphia, "to devise such further provisions as might appear to be necessary to render the Constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the Union."

When this Convention met, in the following spring, the Revolutionary Congress and the Confederation had both had a fair trial, and both had failed to meet the real wants of the country. In the lapse of time all the inherent defects of a mere federal compact had become apparent. From the neglect of the States to comply with the requisitions of Congress, and the want of authority in that body to enforce its own measures, the finances had fallen into hopeless confusion. By reason of the restrictions imposed upon Congress by the sixth section of the ninth Article of Confederation, and the lax attendance of its members, it had often been in the power of a very small minority to defeat the most important and salutary measures. For want of a national judiciary it had been found impossible to carry out the stipulations of the treaty of peace with Great Britain. From the silence of the Articles of Confederation on the subject, it was inferred that Congress had no right to aid the State governments in putting down domestic outbreaks; and consequently, in her hour of peril, Massachusetts had received no assistance in quelling the insurrection of Shays. For want of authority to regulate trade and com-

merce, it had been found impossible to introduce a uniform system of import duties, and to meet the hostile legislation of other countries by corresponding restrictions in our own ports. For want of sufficient and accurately defined powers, great difficulties had been experienced in legislating for the Northwestern Territory; and the questions connected with this momentous subject were pressing for immediate solution. That some remedy for these evils and defects must be speedily found, was almost universally acknowledged. But as to the nature of this remedy there was great difference of opinion. On the one hand, it was contended that all needed reforms could be engrafted upon the Confederation without a radical change of system, — that it was only necessary to enlarge the powers of Congress in order to give to that body all the efficiency that was desirable. On the other hand, it was maintained that this whole system was wrong in theory, and inadequate to the wants of the country, — that the Confederation must be dissolved, and a new government must be established, “consisting of a supreme legislative, executive, and judiciary,” dealing directly with the whole people.

These two opinions and theories were brought into contact in the Convention from the first, and continued to influence the votes of members throughout its whole proceedings. In arranging the details designed to embody these theories, there were also great differences of opinion, as we shall have occasion to notice; and it was only by successive concessions and compromises, that a final concurrence of the great majority of the Convention in favor of the second plan was obtained. The general features of this plan were embodied in a series of resolutions introduced by Edmund Randolph of Virginia, on the 29th of May, immediately after the organization of the Convention and the adoption of its standing rules. “The character of such a government,” he declared, “ought to secure, first, against foreign invasion; secondly, against dissensions between members of the Union, or seditions in particular States; thirdly, to procure to the several States various blessings, of which an isolated situation was incapable; fourthly, it should be able to defend itself against encroachment; and fifthly, to be paramount to the State Constitutions.” In ac-

cordance with these views, his resolutions provided for a national Legislature consisting of two branches, — the members of which were to be proportioned either according to the quota of contribution, or to the number of free inhabitants; for a national Executive and a Council of Revision to examine every act of the Legislature before it should become law; for a national Judiciary consisting of one or more supreme tribunals and of inferior courts; for the admission of new States; and for the ratification of the proposed changes by the people of the several States. These resolutions were at once referred to a committee of the whole house; and on the same day, another plan of a Federal Constitution was presented by Mr. Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, and also referred to the committee of the whole. Mr. Pinckney's plan provided for a similar distribution of powers in the new government, and that all constitutional acts of the Legislature, and all treaties made under the authority of the United States, should be "the supreme law of the land." But we are not aware that any authentic copy of this plan is in existence, — the copy in the Madison Papers being confessedly defective. These two plans gave direction to the earliest discussions in the Convention, and indeed formed the basis of the system ultimately adopted.

In these discussions many members participated, but Madison, Randolph, Wilson, Gouverneur Morris, Gerry, and Dr. Franklin took the largest share; and it was not until the 13th of June that the committee reported. Their report covered nineteen resolutions, which had been separately adopted, and in several instances only after the most strenuous opposition by the minority. These resolutions declared that a national government ought to be established, consisting of three departments, executive, legislative, and judicial; that the national legislature ought to consist of two branches; that the members of the first branch ought to be chosen by the people of the several States, and the members of the second branch by the individual Legislatures; that the right of suffrage in both branches ought to be "in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants, of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude

for a term of years, and three fifths of all other persons, not comprehended in the foregoing description, except Indians not paying taxes, in each State";—in other words, that the right of each State to an equal vote in Congress, which had been the rule in the Revolutionary Congress and under the Confederation, ought to give place to a more equitable system; that the Executive ought to consist of a single person, who should hold office for seven years, and be ineligible for a second term; that the Judiciary ought to consist of one supreme tribunal, and of such inferior tribunals as the Legislature should appoint; that provision ought to be made for the admission of new States; that "a republican constitution, and its existing laws, ought to be guaranteed to each State, by the United States"; and that certain other specified provisions ought to be adopted. The whole system was opposed by several of the members, who both doubted the expediency of adopting such a system, and denied the power of the Convention to propose a change in the principle of the existing government. But the point to which the greatest exception was taken was that involving the right of suffrage. The rule adopted in the organization of the first Congress had been the result of necessity; but no considerations of justice or propriety demanded the continuance of the system. Yet the representatives of the smaller States stoutly resisted any change, alleging that a proportional representation struck at the existence of the lesser States, which would have everything to fear from the ambition of their more populous neighbors, unless they were protected from it by an equality of votes in the Legislature. At a very early stage in the discussions, Mr. Read of Delaware intimated that the delegates from that State "were restrained by their commission from assenting to any change of the rule of suffrage, and in case such a change should be fixed on, it might become their duty to retire from the Convention." At a later period Mr. Patterson of New Jersey declared that his State would "never confederate upon the plan before the committee. She would be swallowed up. He had rather submit to a monster, to a despot, than to such a fate. He would not only oppose the plan here, but on his return home do everything in his power to defeat it there."

Before the report of the committee was taken into consideration, the delegates of the smaller States held a meeting and agreed upon a plan for the revision of the Articles of Confederation in accordance with the views of the minority. This plan was presented to the Convention by Mr. Patterson, and was commonly designated as the New Jersey plan, in order to distinguish it from the Virginia plan, as Mr. Randolph's resolutions were called. It proposed to grant certain additional powers to Congress without changing its organization; to authorize the election of a Federal Executive to be chosen by Congress; to establish a Federal Judiciary to try certain cases; to provide that all acts of Congress authorized by the Articles of Confederation and the amendments thereto, and all treaties made and ratified under the authority of the United States, should be the supreme law of the respective States; to provide for the admission of new States; to establish a uniform rule of naturalization; and to provide for the punishment of offences committed by a citizen of one State within the territory of another State. In presenting this scheme Mr. Patterson very skilfully contrasted the two plans thus brought before the Convention, pointing out with equal ability the defects in the Virginia plan and the advantages to be anticipated from the adoption of his own resolutions. "He argued with much acuteness," as Mr. Curtis observes, "that there was either a present confederacy of the States, or there was not; that if there was, it was one founded on the equal sovereignties of the States, and that it could be changed only by the consent of all; that, as some of the States would not consent to the changes proposed, it was necessary to adhere to the system of representation by States; and that a system of representation of the people of the States was inconsistent with the preservation of the State sovereignties."* The answer to this objection was obvious, and was very forcibly presented by Wilson, Hamilton, and Madison. The Convention, as the majority readily admitted, could not adopt any system which should be binding on the States, without their consent or the consent of the people; but it

* Vol. II. pp. 93, 94.

was certainly "at liberty to propose anything," and in the perilous condition of the country it was the duty of the Convention to propose such a system as might seem to be best suited to the exigencies of the Union, and recommend its adoption. To these considerations Mr. Madison added some remarks on the various infractions of the Articles of Confederation which might be supposed to release the States from further continuance in the Union, and the effect, on the smaller States, of its dissolution.

In the previous discussions Hamilton had taken no active share; "partly," as he intimated, "from respect to others whose superior abilities, age, and experience rendered him unwilling to bring forward ideas dissimilar to theirs; and partly from his delicate situation with respect to his own State, to whose sentiments, as expressed by his colleagues, he could by no means accede." He now came forward, however, to express his well-considered views on the whole subject before the Convention. In a speech which occupied the whole of the session of the 18th of June he stated his objections to the two plans already submitted, laid down the great and essential principles necessary for the support of government, and read the outline of a plan which he thought preferable to the Virginia plan, intimating, however, that he should probably propose some amendments to the latter instead of offering his own scheme. According to this plan the Executive and the Senate were to hold their offices during good behavior; the State Executives were to be appointed by the General Government; and the National and State Executives were to possess an unrestricted veto power. The speech was evidently a very elaborate and carefully prepared production; but unfortunately no full and accurate report of it is extant. It is principally upon the brief and imperfect notes which alone remain that Hamilton's enemies have based the well-known charge that he sought to establish a monarchy, and that his opinions and aims were alike hostile to republican institutions. This charge has been often brought forward by political partisans, and is reiterated by Mr. Randall in his recent *Life of Jefferson*. Yet it is without any solid foundation in fact, and is only supported by a distortion of the

language of a meagre report, unsustained by anything under his own hand. In theory Hamilton undoubtedly thought the English Constitution the best system of government which the wit or wisdom of man had devised. But when he expressed this opinion he was exhibiting the defects of the two plans then before the Convention, both of which differed in several important particulars from the system afterwards adopted; and he explicitly declared that a republican form of government was alone practicable in this country. The whole subject of Hamilton's alleged monarchical tendencies and designs is discussed with great ability by Mr. Curtis, in the text of his *History* and in an elaborate note. After remarking that he has collated Mr. Madison's report, "sentence by sentence, with the report in Judge Yates's *Minutes*, and with Hamilton's own brief," he gives the result of this comparison of all the known authorities:— "1. That Hamilton, in stating his views of the theoretical value of different systems of government, frankly expressed the opinion that the British Constitution was the best form which the world had then produced;—citing the praise bestowed upon it by Necker, that it is the only government 'which unites public strength with individual security.' 2. That, with equal clearness, he stated it as his opinion, that none but a republican form could be attempted in this country, or would be adapted to our situation. 3. That he proposed to look to the British Constitution for nothing but those elements of stability and permanency which a republican system requires, and which may be incorporated into it without changing its characteristic principles." * We fully concur with our author in maintaining that it is unjust to impute to Hamilton "any other than a sincere desire for the establishment and success of republican government." † To the establishment of a strong government upon a republican basis all his efforts were directed; and to him, as much as to any other man, are we indebted for the success of the experiment.

Hitherto the principal difficulty in the minds of many of the members had been that which regarded the right of suf-

* Vol. II. p. 113.

† Vol. II. p. 114.

frage in the new Legislature,—whether the States should have an equal vote, or whether it should be “according to some equitable ratio of representation.” But the moment the debates turned from general principles to questions of detail, new and formidable difficulties arose on every side. We have now to consider what were these difficulties, and by what compromises and concessions the differences of opinion which existed on almost every point were accommodated. It should be observed, however, that the Convention had adopted at one of its earliest sessions a rule which greatly facilitated the arrangement of difficult questions, and prepared the way for most of the subsequent compromises. On the 29th of May a rule was adopted, at the suggestion of Mr. Spaight of North Carolina, allowing a reconsideration of all questions to be moved at any stage in the discussions, upon one day’s previous notice. The wisdom of this rule was repeatedly manifest during the debates; and under its operation the Convention was enabled to modify, and frequently to reverse, decisions already reached on matters of detail, and to bring all the parts of the new Constitution into harmony with each other. After a brief discussion, the Convention postponed the further consideration of Mr. Patterson’s plan, and took up the report of the committee of the whole upon the Virginia plan. The debate lasted from the 19th of June until the 26th of July, and the resolutions reported by the committee were very fully and carefully examined. The result of this discussion was the introduction of some important changes in the plan, as originally drawn up by Mr. Randolph and as subsequently modified in the committee of the whole. Of these changes the most important in theory, and in the practical effects which were likely to follow its adoption, had reference to the manner in which the two branches of the Legislature should be constituted, and to the right of suffrage in them. The resolutions of the committee had provided that each branch should have the right of originating acts, and that the basis of representation in each should be the same. The only differences which they proposed to make between the two branches respected the manner of election, the tenure of office, and the age at which the

members of the second branch should be eligible. The members of the first branch, according to the plan reported, were to be chosen by the people of the several States for the term of three years. The members of the second branch were to be chosen by the State Legislatures for the term of seven years; and it was further provided that they should be at least thirty years of age. To this plan there were some real and weighty objections, in the fact that the difference in the constitution of the two branches was not sufficient to make one an effectual check upon the other. The need of some such difference was sufficiently obvious; but it was by no means clear how this difference could be established. It could not be founded upon differences of rank, because no such differences existed in the United States. Nor would it have been either desirable or practicable to have made the wealth of the several States a basis on which to found a right of representation, since slavery existed to a much greater extent in some of the States than it did in others, and this circumstance would have been a fruitful source of discord. Added to this difficulty, which would probably have proved insuperable, it would have been a matter requiring much time, and the most careful comparison, to fix upon any common standard as the measure of wealth in the different States; and in consequence of the unequal growth of the different sections of the country, a new valuation must have been made at least as often as each new census was taken. There was, indeed, one other way in which an essential difference between the two branches could be established; but that opened anew the question of the right of suffrage. If for any purpose each State was to be considered in its corporate capacity as entitled to an equal weight in the government, then the second branch might with propriety be regarded as representing the individual States, and each State would be entitled to an equal voice. The first branch, on the other hand, would represent the people divided into constituencies of nearly equal size, and each constituency would be entitled to an equal voice. By such a plan, a real distinction would be established between the two branches, and the strongest argument against the creation of two legislative bodies would be practically answered.

This plan was strongly supported by the delegates from the smaller States, and by all the members who were opposed to what was called the "national" system; and it was as stoutly resisted by the delegates from the larger States, and by the advocates of a "national" government. The debate lasted only a part of two days, but it was conducted with great earnestness and in an unyielding temper. On the division, five States voted in favor of an equal representation; five voted against it; and the delegation of one State was divided.* For a moment it seemed probable that the attempt to form a government must be given up, and the Convention be dissolved without accomplishing any part of its design. But this evil was happily averted by the adoption of a motion proposed by General Pinckney of South Carolina, for a committee of one member from each State to devise and report a compromise. This committee reported at the next session two propositions, which they desired should be considered as a whole. According to the first proposition, each State was to be allowed one representative in the first branch for every forty thousand inhabitants, and this branch was to possess the exclusive right of originating all money-bills, none of which should be altered or amended in the second branch. According to the second proposition, each State was to have an equal vote in the second branch. The acceptance of the report was resisted by Madison, Gouverneur Morris, and others; and finally the first part was referred to a new committee, to determine the exact number of members which each State should be allowed in the first branch. The debate was then resumed, and the members from the larger States, with much uniformity of opinion, maintained that the clause relating to money-bills was not a concession on the part of the smaller States, and that it was not in fact desirable that either branch of the legislature should possess the exclusive right of originating such bills. The debate was protracted over more than a week, and involved, in

* The States which voted *aye* were Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. Those which voted *no*, were Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. The vote of Georgia was equally divided; and the delegates from New Hampshire had not arrived. Rhode Island was not represented in the Convention.

addition to the general question of an equal or a proportional representation, some other topics of much importance, which were now prominently brought forward for the first time. Finally, after receiving some amendments, the plan of a proportional representation in the first branch, with the exclusive right of originating money-bills and a proviso that representation ought always to be proportioned to direct taxation, and of an equal representation in the second branch, was adopted by a vote of five States to four, — Massachusetts being divided, and the delegates from New York having returned home.* Such was the origin of the first great compromise of the Constitution; and such in brief is the history of the successive steps by which it was effected. The other changes and additions made by the Convention need not detain us here, since they will properly be discussed at a later stage in these remarks. On the 26th of July, the resolutions adopted by the Convention, to the number of twenty-three, and the propositions offered by Mr. Pinckney and Mr. Patterson, were referred to a committee of detail, consisting of Rutledge, Randolph, Gorham, Ellsworth, and Wilson, to draft a Constitution conformable to the resolutions. The Convention then adjourned until the 6th of August.

On that day the committee reported the draft of a Constitution, in twenty-three articles, embodying the features which had already received the sanction of a majority of the Convention, and adding some new provisions designed to perfect the instrument and make it more generally acceptable. The Convention at once entered upon a careful examination of the proposed draft in all its particulars; and so protracted was the discussion, and so great the difference of opinion on many points, that it was not until the 8th of September that a final decision was reached in regard to all the provisions reported by the committee. The debates were often marked by great warmth; and more than once it seemed well-nigh impossible to settle upon any course in which the different parties would concur. More than once, indeed, failure seemed inevitable;

* Yates and Lansing had withdrawn from the Convention, in consequence of the adoption of the principle of popular representation. Hamilton was absent on private business.

and nothing but a settled conviction in the minds of a great majority of the members, that their adjournment without the adoption of some system would certainly produce a disruption of the existing Union, could have brought about an agreement. To these important debates, and to an examination of the various compromises by which the discordant views of different members were at length harmonized, Mr. Curtis has devoted about half of the volume before us. We would gladly follow him through these weighty chapters; but we can now only indicate a few of the points which were most warmly discussed in the Convention, and upon which he bestows most attention.

The first subject on which any marked difference of opinion was exhibited, was that much vexed question of the constitution of the Legislature. As this question now came before the Convention, it involved several subsidiary questions, which were not without difficulty, and in reference to which members divided upon various grounds. Among the most important of these questions were those relating to the persons who should have a right to vote for members of the popular branch; to the qualifications of the members themselves; to the exclusive control of the House of Representatives over money-bills; to the manner in which the Senators should vote; and to the payment of the members. On some of these points the plan of the committee was adopted; but in regard to others an entirely different system prevailed. After much discussion it was wisely determined to adhere to the plan proposed by the committee in regard to the qualifications of the electors of members of the new House of Representatives; and it was finally voted, without opposition, that "the qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors in the several States of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures." In regard to the members themselves, the Convention struck out of the proposed plan a clause authorizing the Legislature to establish a uniform property qualification, and extended the term of citizenship from three years to seven years. The exclusive power of the House of Representatives over money-bills was stricken out by a large majority; but subsequently a provision was inserted conferring upon that body the exclusive right of originating bills for raising

a revenue. The debate in regard to the qualifications of Senators reopened some of the questions previously discussed in regard to the qualifications of Representatives. The Convention accordingly extended the period of four years' citizenship, proposed by the committee, to a term of nine years. It sanctioned, however, the number of Senators which the committee proposed to allow to each State, and also adopted the proposed plan by which each Senator was allowed a single vote. The mode of payment was changed from a payment by the several States to a payment from the national treasury.

The next article in the proposed Constitution enumerated the powers granted to the Legislature, and gave rise to a still more animated discussion. The want of power to regulate commerce had been one of the most serious defects in the Articles of Confederation; and it was to the evils arising from the various enactments on the subject by the different States, as much as to any other cause, that the Convention owed its existence. But the interests of the several States were by no means the same, and the report of the committee in favor of granting commercial powers to the new government was warmly attacked from various quarters. No sooner had the first section of this article been taken up, than a motion was made to add to it a clause prohibiting the Legislature from laying any duty upon exports, although such a provision had been inserted in another place. From considerations of expediency, growing out of the great variety of agricultural products raised in the States and the limited space over which each was cultivated, it was undoubtedly judicious to withhold a power the exercise of which must have given rise to ceaseless sectional controversies. But in theory there was no valid reason why Congress should not be intrusted with this power, and on this question issue was taken. Before a vote was reached, the subject was postponed in order to take up some other clauses, most of which were adopted with but little opposition. Five days afterwards the subject again came up in course, when the prohibition was sustained by a vote of seven States to four; and the Convention passed to the next clause, which extended this prohibition to the levying of any tax "on the migration or importation of such persons as the several

States shall think proper to admit," and the passing of any law forbidding "such migration or importation." The effect of these provisions was to place the slave-trade entirely beyond the control of the new government. Accordingly they were strenuously resisted by most of the members who represented States in which few or no slaves were owned; and they were as zealously supported by most of the members from the great slaveholding States, several of whom distinctly and emphatically declared that their States would never assent to the Constitution if it prohibited the importation of slaves.* The difference of opinion became so apparently irreconcilable, that it was at length voted to refer this subject, and the clauses relative to the assessment of a capitation tax and the passage of a navigation act, to a committee consisting of one member from each State, to devise some compromise.

The report of this committee was the basis of what Mr. Curtis denominates "The Grand Compromises of the Constitution respecting Commerce, Exports, and the Slave-Trade." Two days after the subject was committed, they reported in favor of providing that "the migration or importation of such persons as the several States, now existing, shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited prior to the year 1800; but a tax or duty may be imposed on such migration or importation, at a rate not exceeding the average of the duties laid on imports"; — that the clause in regard to a capitation tax should stand without alteration, and that there should be no restriction of the power of Congress to pass a navigation act. The report was taken into consideration on the following day, and after remarks by several members the first part was agreed to with two amendments, — the first substituting "the year 1808" for "the year 1800," and the second establishing the tax on such importations at the sum of ten dollars. The second part was adopted without opposition, and the third part was likewise adopted at a subsequent day.

The constitution and powers of the Legislature having been settled, a few other points remained for consideration before

* Both Mr. Ellsworth and Mr. Sherman of Connecticut spoke in favor of the prohibition. Luther Martin of Maryland and Colonel Mason of Virginia spoke against it.

providing for the executive and judicial departments. Most of these points had reference to the restraints which it might be thought desirable to impose upon Congress and the individual States. Accordingly a new clause was inserted in the proposed draft, prohibiting Congress from passing any *ex post facto* law, and a clause was also added, to the effect that no person in the employment of the United States should accept of any present, emolument, office, or title from any foreign power without the consent of the Legislature. The important provision in regard to the supremacy of the general government was verbally amended to make it still stronger, and then unanimously adopted. The effect of this provision was to render all State laws inoperative which were contrary to the Constitution of the United States, the laws made in pursuance thereof, and the treaties made under the authority of the United States. At a subsequent stage in the proceedings, other restraints were also imposed upon the States. In the Constitution reported by the committee of detail, only four acts were absolutely prohibited to the States. These were the coining of money; the granting of letters of marque and reprisal; the entering into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; and the granting of any title of nobility. To these the Convention added, the emission of bills of credit; the making of anything except gold and silver coin a legal tender in the payment of debts; and the passage of any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; and it also enlarged the list of acts which could only be operative with the consent of Congress.

In regard to the construction of the executive department there was scarcely any question in reference to which some member had not expressed an opinion at variance with that entertained upon the same subject by one or more of his associates; and several of the most important decisions of the Convention had been reversed from time to time. Among the decisions thus reversed were those determining the manner in which the President should be elected, the length of time during which he should hold office, and his eligibility for a second term. It is not necessary for our present purpose to trace the history of the various plans for the settlement of these

questions which were proposed or adopted, nor to consider the reasons which led to their final rejection. It will be sufficient to consider the principal features in the arrangement ultimately adopted, and the grounds upon which this adjustment rested. The whole subject had been thoroughly discussed, but without any satisfactory result, and its consideration was several times postponed in order to take up less difficult questions. At length, on the last day of August, it was referred to a committee of one from each State, together with some other provisions which had not yet been settled. On the 4th of September the committee made a report which presents the germ of the provisions in the Constitution as adopted, although their plan was modified in several respects. There had been a strong opposition to a direct election of the President by the people; but all the plans suggested were marked by serious difficulties. In order to obviate these difficulties, the committee recommended that the election should be vested in electors appointed in such a manner as the State legislatures might direct. If the electors failed to choose a President, he was to be chosen by the Senate; but in order to insure a 'greater degree of independence in the Executive, the Convention transferred this power of election to the House of Representatives.* After the rejection of numerous amendments, the plan was adopted, with this modification. It did not, however, prove satisfactory in its practical working; and some of its most characteristic features were afterwards changed by the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution. Provision was also made for the choice of a Vice-President, — though no such officer had been recognized in the draft prepared by the committee of detail, — and for the succession to the Presidency in the event of the death, absence, resignation, or inability of the President to discharge the duties of his office. The powers of the President were likewise carefully defined, after much consideration and frequent modifications of the original plan. His term of office was reduced to four years, and the clause rendering him ineligible for a second term was stricken out.

* The reason for this change was a fear that the Senate would exercise an undue influence in the government, if they were to be invested with the power of choosing a President, in addition to their power of rejecting his nominations to office, of ratifying or rejecting all treaties, and of trying all impeachments.

In organizing the Judiciary and defining its powers there were also considerable differences of opinion to be encountered; but the plan of the committee was adopted, with a few amendments designed to extend the jurisdiction of the new courts. It granted, as finally adopted, a full power in law and equity, extending to all cases which might arise under the Constitution, the laws, or the treaties of the United States; to cases affecting foreign states or their subjects; to all maritime questions; to all controversies affecting the United States; to all controversies between different States or the citizens thereof, and between citizens of the same State claiming lands under the grants of different States. And in order to secure the impartiality and independence of the judges of the United States, and to prevent them from ever becoming the victims of partisan rage, the Convention not only provided that they should hold office during good behavior, and that they should receive a stated compensation, which should not be diminished during their continuance in office, but it also provided that they should only be removable by impeachment. An amendment was indeed offered, providing for their removal on application by the Senate and House of Representatives, but it was opposed by Gouverneur Morris, Rutledge, Wilson, and Randolph, and was rejected with great unanimity, — Connecticut alone voting in its favor.

The most important provisions in the remaining articles of the proposed plan were designed to secure to the citizens of each State the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States, and full faith to the laws of the States and the records of their various magistrates; to secure the delivery of fugitives from justice; to establish the manner in which new States might be admitted; to guarantee to the several States a republican form of government, and protection against foreign invasion and domestic violence; to prescribe the manner in which amendments to the Constitution might be made, and in which the Constitution should be ratified and the new government organized. These provisions were severally agreed to, with some modifications and additions which did not materially affect the original plan. Of the additions, the most important was the clause providing for the surrender of

fugitives from service, which was added to the clause for the surrender of fugitives from justice.

Having thus completed its examination of the proposed draft, the Convention on the 8th of September referred the amended plan to a committee of revision, consisting of Dr. Johnson, Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, Madison, and Rufus King. On the 12th, this committee reported the Constitution in a new draft, reducing the twenty-three articles of the original draft to seven, and making some changes in the arrangement of the several parts. The Constitution was then read article by article, and after receiving some verbal and other slight amendments, it was finally adopted by a unanimous vote of the States, on Monday, the 17th of September, and was signed by most of the members. Among those who did not sign it, and who held themselves at liberty to oppose its ratification, were Elbridge Gerry, Luther Martin, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and George Wythe, some of whom subsequently opposed its adoption with great energy and ability.*

Mr. Curtis has devoted his last Book, covering a little more than a hundred pages, to an account of the adoption of the Constitution. The struggle between the friends of a strong government and the advocates of a mere revision of the Articles of Confederation, which had been so long waged in the Convention, was now renewed in the State Conventions, and through the public press. In this new contest Hamilton was the ablest and most conspicuous advocate of the Constitution. His exertions were ably seconded by Madison, Jay, Wilson, and others. In the opposition, Luther Martin, Patrick Henry, and George Mason labored with a zeal, energy, and wealth of resources, which for a time rendered the result doubtful. But the fabric, for good or for evil, was destined to rise triumphant over all opposition. The Conventions of Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut, ratified the Constitution unanimously, or by large majorities, before the close of January, 1788. On the 6th of the following Feb-

* Governor Randolph afterwards so far modified his opinions as to advocate the ratification, in a speech delivered in the Virginia Convention. A portion of this speech is printed in the first volume of Moore's *American Eloquence*.

ruary, Massachusetts also gave her assent, by a majority of 187 to 168; but she added a recommendation that certain amendments should be adopted. Within six months from that time, Maryland, South Carolina, New Hampshire, Virginia, and New York followed,—all but Maryland proposing amendments. North Carolina and Rhode Island withheld their ratifications until after the organization of the government. It only remained, therefore, when the assent of nine States had been obtained, to put the machinery of the new government in operation, and to determine whether any of the amendments recommended by the State Conventions should be adopted as part of the fundamental law. Into that chapter of our history Mr. Curtis does not now enter; but we gather from his concluding paragraph that it is his intention to complete the survey of our early constitutional history by narrating the events of Washington's administration. To that period we must look for the first and most authentic interpretation of the instrument the history of which we have been considering; and in this view it is a fortunate circumstance that the men who were first called upon to administer the government were those who had taken part in framing the Constitution, or in defending it before the people and in the State Conventions.

ART. V.—MR. COMBE ON SCULPTURE AND PAINTING.

Phrenology applied to Painting and Sculpture. By GEORGE COMBE.
London. 1855.

MR. COMBE complains that the expositions of phrenology, in works claiming to represent the actual condition of knowledge, like the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, have been written by its opponents only, and asks what would be thought were its article on Christianity written by a Jew. We cannot think Mr. Combe would wish the work in question to be a collection of special pleas for its various departments. For a thorough believer to have written the article on Phrenology,

would not have been proper in a work intended for a community where disbelief is prevalent; not that such a work should cater to prevalent opinions, but that a person possessing the means of knowing what is claimed for phrenology, and having no bias in its favor, could best weigh its pretensions in accordance with the standard of knowledge then existing. To employ a Jew to write on Christianity for a public that is wholly Christian, Mr. Combe must see, is altogether another thing. To attack phrenology by ridicule, though that may be the only way of meeting a stubborn adherent, would not be wise in a reviewer for a dispassionate community. If the writer in the Encyclopædia was captious, he was unwise. But at this day, we are not surprised that such a standard should pronounce adversely to the claims of phrenology. Mr. Combe, in the work before us, has not written captiously himself, and we have no mind to find fault in return, but shall endeavor calmly to state his views, and the extent to which we can coincide with them.

Before the appearance of Ruskin, it must be acknowledged, English criticism of art partook largely of the nature of cant. It dealt largely in such pet phrases as *handling*, *chiaroscuro*, and the like. The sanguine author of "Modern Painters" went to work in a different spirit, and listened to his own feelings rather than to antecedent writers. He knew what his own sensations were, and could analyze them, never springing the arch of inference without first throwing forward a pier of reason to sustain the falling end. Mr. Combe refines upon this process. He *feels* himself incited to a scheme of calculation, which must end in a mathematical certainty. What originated in feeling, is used irrespective of feeling when once established to his satisfaction, and becomes a gauge to be applied to art by a very mechanical process. This gauge, he contends, is indispensable to the artist and his critic. He attaches great importance to rules. Titian and Turner colored well, but what their genius intuitively arrived at, the color-blind can also attain by observing the precepts derived from an analysis of their works. So, again, a so-called intuitive power is admissible. It is not that the eye of a bricklayer becomes in itself more exquisitely devel-

oped, but it is the growth of his faculties, his sense of weight and momentum, that enables him to lay a perpendicular wall. Moreover, if the artist has a large base of brain, it follows as a matter of course that he will sympathize with savageness and the like, and paint more naturally scenes of banditti and torture.

Mr. Combe does not deny the paramount power of genius, but genius without rules, he contends, relying solely upon impulse, may sometimes err. He claims, and perhaps rightly enough, that genius without knowing it, and by intuition, works itself into a position attainable by a process of reasoning on facts. When such a painter as Raphael, who lived when phrenology, as a so-called science, was not thought of, is found to depict the human figure in exact accordance with phrenological precepts, it is not only, to Mr. Combe's mind, a proof of his superior genius, but also, by a reversion of reasoning, an argument for the science itself.

It is not to the shape of the head alone that this science pertains. It is claimed that all those portions of the body worked upon by the brain are capable of showing the nature of the man in the same degree. The old Grecian painter, when he showed us the agonized father, hid his face in a robe, but he still left the impress of the emotions visible in the posture and figure. It is not the head and face alone that *express*, but also the limbs, in their proportions, attitudes, actions, and texture. To make general distinctions, a brain of large intellectual development is always accompanied (other things being equal) by firm, elastic, clearly defined limbs, of a quick, nervous surface; while smallness in that particular (as in an idiot) produces ungainly proportions, awkward motions, and flabby texture. In persons of moral pre-eminence, the forms are round and graceful, but the texture softer and less elastic. When the lower passions prevail, the limbs are coarse, the muscles covered with fat, and ropelike when visible. Now for a painter to derange these concomitants, is to commit a great incongruity,—such, for instance, as Raphael knew how to avoid, but David is guilty of. One who looks at *The School of Athens* will be struck with the weightiness of character in the picture, feeling that he sees

men of mark ; while in most of the classical subjects by David (how one sickens of them in the Louvre!) he can but feel that the men are merely players ; the personages are not equal to the scene. Mr. Combe's reason is, that, in the one case, we see large-headed, nobly-shaped men, all in the attitudes expressive of their minds ; while, in the other, despite brilliant painting, and strong and earnest attitudes, there is a want of character perceptible in disproportionately small and meanly-shaped heads. Raphael is again brought to the test with Julio Romano. *The Crowning of the Virgin*, by the latter, in the Vatican, shows the Apostles standing around the sarcophagus, while Jesus crowns the Virgin in the sky. The arrangement in the group below, is only such as would result from small brains in intense activity, — staring eyes, raised hands, violent attitudes, and sharp, angular motions ; “and on examining the head and features,” says Mr. Combe, “I found the like correspondence in mental incapacity.” This was truth, but in a less grand way than Raphael showed it. It was early in his career that he painted the same subject, and his treatment evinced youthful shortcomings ; yet there was a calm strength of graceful wonderment in the Apostles, far more effective than Julio Romano's, and evincing larger minds, while it rendered all the more painful the smooth inanity of the cheeks, showing in that respect a want of mental life.

Another picture of Raphael's, *The Espousal of the Virgin*, shows the argument in a better light. The head of the Madonna is beautifully proportioned, very large in the moral regions, and by a happy chance so placed as to show by drawing and shading large adhesiveness and philoprogenitiveness, but small amateness, — the figure exactly corresponding, — giving a correct embodiment of such immaculate holiness as was properly assigned to her. Shocking it was to Mr. Combe to see a hireling artist undertaking to copy this picture ; for, by a slight and careless varying of the lines, he had made a head such as could only belong to a sensual person. It is significant, that, while other painters were wont to represent their mistresses with the holy accompaniments of the Madonna, in none of Raphael's can the slightest trace of the Fornarina be found. In his last picture, — *The Transfigura-*

tion, — Mr. Combe does not find the great painter so free from error as he would wish. Our critic could but acknowledge its masterly grouping and perfection of drawing, and all its technical excellences; but at the same time could not feel that he was looking at the first picture in the world, and for this reason, — the nervous flutter of the spectators, in look, attitude, and action, signifies commonplace minds with their mental equilibrium upset, whereas the artist should have given them the calm, deep expression of perplexity and wonder which signifies a great mind. At least, such should have been the case with the prominent disciples. Mr. Combe would shield his favorite painter, by supposing that the predisposition to disease, which soon produced death, was already upon him, enfeebling the mind.

That the mind can even inform the drapery of the figure, is another proposition of our phrenologist. And he is right. Everybody knows that the garments of a nervous, quick person hang differently from those of a person of grand, dignified demeanor; and in each case characteristically. The best portraitists know this, and will not willingly paint drapery from a lay figure, for this reason, — that in a picture (not representing action) the folds of a robe can be made to express what the individual's motions ordinarily are. Should any be inclined to doubt this, no less an authority than Sir Joshua Reynolds confronts them. It is not uncommon to find in all critics a tacit acknowledgment of it. Kugler, the German authority, in speaking of *The Transfiguration*, says: "In one respect the picture appears to fail; it wants the freer, purer beauty, *the simplicity and flow of line (in the drapery especially)*, which address themselves so directly to the feeling of the spectator." It is curious to compare this with Mr. Combe's criticism, where no mention is made of the drapery. The two start from opposite points. The phrenologist sees the agitated limbs, and knows that, as a matter of course, angular, jerking folds must follow in the garments. The other sees at once the disagreeable effect of the drapery, and wants more grace, without even perceiving that it could not consistently be had but by changing the style of action. We think Mr. Combe in this instance

sustains himself as the more thorough critic. In the cartoon of *The Charge to Peter*, still further derelictions on the part of the great Raphael are noted. In the head of Christ the brain is only of average size, with moderate intellectual faculties, well developed in benevolence and veneration, but deficient in ideality, (he also marks the correspondence of countenance with this combination,) making him nothing more than a sober, serious, good man taking leave of his friends; whereas if ideality and the moral attributes had been large, with corresponding lines of face, there would not have been this lack of weight and dignity of character, but a fine and exalted nature. Then again of Titian's *Tribute-Money*, after according great praise to the expression of the Jew, for his undue preponderance of the intellect over the moral powers, with his bilious temperament and corresponding coarseness of form and skin, he contrasts it with the figure of Christ, so opposite in form, texture, and expression. To those who urge that Titian has made the head of Christ too feeble and inexpressive, he replies thus:—

“The predominant elements in the character of Jesus are love, gentleness, and piety; and the head embodies all these qualities in its forms, while the countenance is in perfect accordance with them, with a remarkable addition. The question was an insidious one, designed to entrap him into sedition. He does not answer it directly. It was dictated by destructiveness and secretiveness, and he answers it by secretiveness and intellect. *Whose superscription is this?* baffles the enemy, without self-committal; and the expression of the eye, the mouth, and cheeks is that which accompanies the activity of secretiveness acting in combination with intellect and the moral sentiments. It does not amount to slyness or cunning, for these are low expressions of secretiveness, inconsistent with the character of Jesus; but there is the expression of a veiled consciousness of cunning in the interrogation, and of consciousness of foiling him with his own weapons. It is this veiling of the internal mental processes which many mistake for feebleness.”

Mr. Combe's fault consists rather in his not discriminating between what would be the state in an ordinary human being, and in one charged with such a mission as Christ. He makes it still worse, when, in the next paragraph, he

recalls, by way of parallel, the manner of Napoleon the Great, who presented a blank face to such as he did not desire to read his thoughts. The whole view taken of the transaction is a false one. In fact there was no non-committalism or secrecy in that answer of our Lord.

Again when he comes to Michel Angelo's statue of *Christ holding the Cross*, he finds but a low character in the form of the head, with peevishness and anger expressed in the countenance; while the body and limbs, by their extraordinary life and energy, could not belong to such a head. He makes a similar criticism on the celebrated *Moses*.

"In short," says he, "M. Angelo, like Shakespeare, committed many sins against taste, nature, and reason, but communicated to his works such a vigorous character of genius, that it carries them triumphantly down the stream of criticism and time, with all their imperfections on their heads, provoking partial condemnation, yet ever carrying captive the sympathies of kindred spirits."

After the treatment of Titian's head of Christ, we were hardly prepared to find the one in the celebrated *Last Supper* of Leonardo da Vinci pronounced more human than divine, for the reason that its large intellectual and moral regions are duly balanced by lateral and basilar developments. This humanity of the head (and it is very impressive as such) is often remarked upon by writers. The tradition connected with it gives it a peculiar interest. The head of Christ, after repeated attempts to give it something more than a human air, Leonardo finally left in despair unfinished. Roscoe and others accredit this statement. If it be true, the head which brings out Combe's judgment was either by one of the many inferior artists to whom its restoration was afterwards committed, or else it was the original sketch by Da Vinci, now preserved on a torn and dirty piece of paper in the Brera at Milan, of which Kugler says, "It expresses the most devoted seriousness, together with divine gentleness, pain on account of the faithless disciple, a full presentiment of his own death, and resignation to the will of the Father; it gives a faint idea of what the master may have accomplished in the finished picture." If tradition is to be believed, Leonardo could not go beyond this "faint idea." To think that an

inferior should have dared it! Assumption is always the accompaniment of inferiority. Those painters best fitted perhaps to appreciate Christ have the least confidence in their ideals of him. There are some of our modern artists (Weir, for instance) who hold it a profanation to portray him. Others despair of attaining that glance of Christ upon Pilate. Milton ventured to give only a vague expression;—

“ Man he seems
In all his lineaments, though in his face
The glimpses of his Father's glories shine.”

There is a strong argument in favor of a pure and devotional tendency of the artist-mind to be found in the history of that type of head known as Christ's. The earliest Christians, after his personal appearance was forgotten, believed in the literal interpretation of the Scripture where reference is made to the meanness of his person. After a while, some one ventured to *feel* that such goodness would not manifest itself in a mean shape. In the fourth century a more general and greater devotional love arose, and we no longer find any of those debasing conceptions among the great writers of the Church. On the contrary, the majesty of his form is dwelt upon, and in art a corresponding type was created. There were, of course, exceptional retrogressions, and some obstinate monks, affecting to believe that beauty was carnal, imagined, we suppose, ugliness to be spiritual. There has been something of this in our modern art; and when we see the flat skulls and weak effeminacy of some of their Redeemers, we are prompted to think that the artists dared not be in the presence of a type nobler than themselves. Men are too prone to put the stamp of themselves upon what they idealize. Bayard Taylor says, in one of his poems,

“ Gods resemble whom they govern.”

It has been often pointed out, how artists have impressed their own natures upon what they painted. This is nowhere more apparent than in their Christs. Those of Michel Angelo, says Fuseli, have the stern severity of his own character, while Raphael imparted his dignified mildness to the type of Church tradition.

We have no inclination to disparage the honest work of phrenologists and physiologists. If they would be content to call their work "Materials for the Understanding of the Nature of Man," without claiming the name of "Science," we believe they would impart knowledge more effectively, and conciliate, where they now repel, the investigating spirit which is sure to confront them.

ART. VI.—ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAMISM.

Die religiöse Seite der Orientalischen Frage. Von C. C. GRAFEN FICQUELMONT. Wien. 1855.

IN the May number of the *Christian Examiner*, we discussed the general European aspects of the Oriental question, and we had intended to state in the present article the grounds of our faith in the ultimate regeneration of the Turkish empire as a Christian state. But the extent of the subject makes it quite impossible to examine it fully within the limits to which we must now confine ourselves, and we shall only attempt to prepare the reader for a better appreciation of conclusions to be presented on a future occasion, by sketching the moral, religious, and intellectual traits of the leading families which are gathered under the Ottoman sceptre, and by pointing out the most formidable obstacles to the Christianization of Turkey. For reasons which we shall presently give, our view of the relations of the Turkish populations to this great question will embrace the position of those races only which are best known to the Christian world, and which at the same time will exert the greatest immediate weight in the resolution of the problem. We must premise, that, in characterizing these races, we can here only give a rapid sketch of the leading features that mark the moral and intellectual constitution, and the social and political position, of each; and it must be borne in mind, that to all such general statements there must be numerous exceptions, both for good and for evil. We shall speak of each people as a whole, with-

out reference to particular localities, and partial qualifications must be omitted as unimportant, or supplied by the intelligent reader. The nations we shall consider are the Ottomans, as the embodiment of the Mohammedan element, the Armenians and the Greeks, as the representatives of the Christian. The Arabs, the Koords, and other minor Mussulman tribes of the empire, are of small importance in any view of the general interests of Christendom. They are accessible to the influences of civilization only through Ottoman channels, and as their religious and political position will in the end be determined by that of their Turkish rulers, we need not make them the subjects of special inquiry. The Armenian and Greek nations do not singly, or even collectively, constitute the most numerous portion of the Christian subjects of the Porte, nor is it by any means certain that they will long retain their relative importance; but, on the other hand, they are the races which, from local position, more developed intelligence, more active, and, so to speak, aggressive tendencies, occupy for the moment the most conspicuous ground, and wield the greatest present influence over the Mussulman population, while they also form the readiest channel of communication between Christianity and Islamism. The Danubian provinces, in any wise and proper distribution of political power and territorial jurisdiction among the states of the Old World, naturally and almost necessarily belong, in common with the entire basin of the Black Sea, to the power which controls the only outlet of the Danube and the Euxine, and therefore are justly regarded by the Ottomans as an integral part of the Turkish empire. But they seem at present much more likely to be severed from it, at least during its transition state, and for this reason, and because their influence is of comparatively little moment in determining the relations of Ottoman Turkey to Christianity and civilization, we shall not here present our views of the character, condition, or prospects of their people, the proper discussion of which would alone require a larger space than we propose to devote to our entire subject. We must, however, observe that it is a great error to assume that the Servians, the Wallachians, the Bulgarians, and the other provincial tribes in which

Slavic blood predominates and the creed of the Oriental Church is generally adopted, are either prepared to bow to the sceptre of Russia, or ready to submit to the arrogant claims of the Byzantine hierarchy to ecclesiastical supremacy. Of these nations, the Bulgarians—who, though generally ranked as slaves, are derived from a Tatar ancestry in a larger proportion than any other European subjects of Turkey—are the most important in their relations to the Mussulmans, both because they are more widely diffused among them, and because they are more accessible to liberal Christian influences, than any other of the so-called Slavic families. So far from habitually confounding themselves, either ecclesiastically or politically, with the Ottoman Greeks, their relations to that race are rather antagonistic; and, scattered as they are in their abodes, they have more of the consciousness of true nationality than the Greeks, who, as we shall show hereafter, are wholly deficient in a sentiment which constitutes an essential element in the character of a people. The Bulgarians, then, to say the least, are not to be regarded as in any sense an obstacle to the liberalization of the existing institutions of Turkey; on the contrary, there is reason to believe that they will be found as readily receptive of a true civilization, and a high moral and social culture, as any portion of the professors of Oriental Christianity.

We begin with the Greeks, not as possessing great numerical importance, or as enjoying any moral, social, or intellectual superiority over the Armenians, but because the relations of the ancient Greeks to literature and civilization have commended their supposed descendants to the warmest sympathies of enlightened Europe and America, while the commercial activity and the constant intercourse of the modern race with Western Christendom have made them familiarly known in Europe, and their clamorous demands for recognition as the only proper representatives of oppressed Christianity in the East, have obtained for them and their claims a degree of consideration to which they are by no means entitled. In describing the character and position of the Greeks, we shall embrace in our view both the Ottoman Greeks and the inhabitants of independent Greece, generally

known in the East by the ancient name of Hellenes. They are one in language, character, faith, and will be one in ultimate political destiny, as they are now one in subserviency to Russia, and in a common hatred of the religions of Western Europe, as well as of the political influences to whose generous intervention they are indebted for all the increased privileges they now enjoy. Most European speculations on the reconstruction of the Ottoman state look more or less directly to the restoration of the old Byzantine empire, and are founded on wholly mistaken impressions with regard to the numbers of the Greek population, and to the qualifications of that race as a governing people. These erroneous views it is important to rectify. In the native circles which cluster around the diplomacy of Constantinople, one is perpetually stunned with the vociferous pretensions of the "Greek element," and with complaints of the error of European statesmen in not having taken this element sufficiently into account. The Frank listener is always presumed to be ignorant of the actual statistics of population, and, though on all other occasions scorning the imputation of a relationship to the Slavic subjects of the Porte, the Greek intriguer boldly claims for his own nationality a plurality, if not an absolute majority, of the population of European Turkey, by embracing under the name of Greek all the communicants of the Oriental orthodox Church, of whatever race or language. By these and other similar means a very exaggerated estimate of the numbers of the Greek population has found currency in Europe, as well as in America. In point of fact, the Greek subjects of the Porte residing in the provinces of Continental Europe fall short of *one million*, and do not exceed six per cent of the population of those territories, while not more than another million are to be found in all Asiatic Turkey and the Mediterranean islands belonging to that power. Of the thirty-five millions of souls, then, subject to the Ottoman state, not more than two millions belong to that race, which, speaking the Greek language and professing the Greek faith, puts forth for itself the extravagant claims to which we have alluded. The other members of the Oriental Church in Turkey amount to something more than four mil-

lions, but, as we have already said, they have no hierarchical, no national sympathies with a people to whom they hold themselves alien in blood, as well as in speech and in political interests. There are small Romish communities in Syria, and elsewhere in Turkey, as well as in Greece proper, usually called by Franks Greek Catholics, amounting altogether to less than 100,000 souls, and who have at least as good a right as the orthodox Greeks to the claim of Hellenic descent. But they repudiate the Greek name; their only recognized bond of union with that people is community of language, and they sympathize so little with the political aims and aspirations of the latter, that during the war of the revolution not one of them joined the insurgents in their efforts to shake off the Turkish yoke.

In speaking of the Ottoman Greeks, we have used the word *nationality* in its common English sense, as indicating community of origin, language, and political organization, and we believe the European and American idea of the sense or feeling of nationality involves these three, and only these elements. If this sense exists anywhere in the East, it is certainly not among the Greeks, who reject the first and last of these ingredients (origin and political condition), and build their notion of nationality on community of language and religious creed alone. To the Ottoman and the independent Hellene alike, whoever speaks Romaic, bows down to *painted* images and abominates *graven* ones, is a Greek; all others are strangers, outlaws, enemies. Through the entire Levant, Christians are classed by their creed, not by their blood, and it is impossible to make yourself understood by the mass of Greek Christians when you ask the *nationality* of an individual as distinguished from his religion. In this absolute want of a great idea, which is perhaps the most important element in the formation of national character, lies one cause of the inaptitude of the Greek for all the higher duties and loftier aims of civil government. To the notion of a commonwealth, a political state founded on common commercial, social, and governmental interests, cemented by community of blood and birthright, and sustained by common sacrifices and mutual concessions, no Greek statesman

of the present generation, whether in Greece or in Turkey, has proved himself capable of rising. An intense fanaticism forms in the Greek mind the only permanent bond of national association, and as nationality presents itself to the Greek in no other form than that of sectarianism, his highest notion of the state is but that of an ecclesiastical hierarchy invested with civil and political functions. It would, however, be an error to infer from this the existence of a deep religious sentiment among the Greeks. Religion is, with them, especially in the higher classes, the conventional symbol of clanship, the pass-word of a cabal, and their religious sympathies manifest themselves much more strongly in combination against strangers than in union among themselves. Social bonds of some sort are instinctively necessary to man as man. To most peoples the feeling of nationality, as we have above defined it, supplies this want; but the Greek, alone of all civilized men, has substituted for that feeling the mere outward token of conformity to the same confessional symbol. This explains, at once, both the tenacity with which he defends his creed when it is assailed by Christians of other communions, and the readiness with which he exchanges Christianity for Islamism, upon the tender of a very moderate consideration. If he renounces orthodoxy to embrace Romanism or Protestantism, he loses his only claim to be called a Greek, his only title to membership of a body politic, a confederate society; whereas upon abjuring Christianity, and acknowledging the divine mission of the Prophet, he is at once received into the bosom of the great family of Islam, and admitted to the enjoyment of what, as a Christian, he could never hope,—the pride of a true and proper nationality.

The want of a sentiment elsewhere so general strikingly distinguishes the Greeks from the Armenians and the Jews, who are remarkable for their strong national as well as their religious cohesion; and we cannot but regard it as possessing some importance as a psychological argument in support of Fallmerayer's theory, that the modern Greeks have little or no ethnological relation to the ancient Hellenes, but are a mixed race, in which the Slavic element is by much the most important. It is a tacit admission of a conscious want of kinship

in the people, either directly with each other, or with those from whom they claim to be descended; and they feel themselves linked together by bonds analogous rather to the *cognatio spiritualis* of the Papal Church than to the ties of consanguinity. We do not propose to discuss this interesting ethnological question, which has been so ably debated in Germany, and we can here only profess our concurrence with those who believe that the ancient Greek blood is very nearly, if not altogether, extinct, in both peninsular and continental Greece. As Sandys said of Palestine that it was "Jewry without Jews," so we hold Greece to be Hellas without Hellenes. Various circumstances render it probable that there is a larger infusion of the Hellenic element in the Greeks of Constantinople than in any other fraction of those who now bear that name; but it must be remembered that the Byzantines never considered themselves as Greeks at all, and it is only since the fall of Constantinople that the claim of Hellenic parentage has, upon the suggestion of Western Europe, been set up by any portion of the modern Greek race. Now, indeed, the Greek ignores his barbarian cousins, and boasts himself a genuine *γῆγενής*, a scion of the true grasshopper stock. Many an Athenian *petit maître*, whose Arnaout father knew no language but Shkipetar, fancies that he feels the blood of the elegant Alcibiades tingle in his veins, and the mixed Avar, Slavic, Albanian, Catalan, Italian, Gothic, and Gallic tribes, that have usurped the name and the place of the extinct Hellenes, plume themselves as much on the martial heroism and the intellectual triumphs of ancient Greece, as if they were the lawful inheritors of the glories of Sparta and of Athens. We would not lay too much stress, in an argument of this sort, on intellectual likeness or unlikeness, and we readily accord to the modern Greeks a liberal share of mental gifts. But no competent observer can fail to remark in them the absolute want of the æsthetic faculty, the sense of the beautiful, for which the Hellenic race was so justly renowned. The modern Greeks have produced neither an art-critic nor an artist, unless we are to honor with that name the *ΠΑΙΤΗΣ* whose sign hangs over almost every third door in Athens. But even in the sartorial department we cannot

allow them originality of design, for their truly gorgeous and graceful national costume is but a modification of the Albanian dress suggested by the English general, Church. Indeed, the Greek exhibits not the slightest trace of constructive power in any of its forms, and he no longer even copies the old Byzantine architecture at Constantinople, the Armenian builder having superseded him.

But to return. As would naturally be expected, a religion valued for such reasons as we have stated has but slender influence upon the morals of its professors, and indeed the ethics of the Greeks are as little to be traced to the precepts of their religion, as is the practical morality of Americans to the "platforms" of the parties with which they vote. Among the Greeks, education is controlled by the clergy, and both by this circumstance and their position as the authoritative teachers of religion they are the institutors of the people, the responsible moulders of the national character and heart. Although religious discourses are occasionally delivered in the churches, yet the pulpit, which elsewhere among Christians is the great organ of moral doctrine, is in general dumb, and preaching forms no part of the regular exercises of public worship. The teachings of the clergy are chiefly catechetical, and they are confined almost wholly to the positive dogmas and the formal observances of their Church. In the popular view, proper *sin* consists only in the denial of the former, or the disregard of the latter of these; transgressions of the moral law, however flagrant, being but human frailties, venial offences, requiring no atonement from the offender but a compliance with the external ordinances of the orthodox Church. With such teaching, we must not be surprised to find the voluntary wrecking of freight-ships for the sake of defrauding the shippers and the underwriters, a part of the regular course of Greek commerce, or to learn that among the most ardent devotees, the most pious worshippers, of the orthodox communion, are uniformly to be found the "free companions," whose trade is theft and piracy and blood.

To this deplorable state of feeling there are, we are abundantly aware, many, very many, most honorable exceptions; but they are too few to make themselves felt in the policy of

the government, in the administration of justice, or in the general tone of public morals. Nay, they are unhappily fewer than they were at the commencement of the revolutionary struggle. At, and for some time before, that period, the sons of opulent families were very generally sent to Europe for their education, and a large proportion of the really influential leaders in the insurrectionary movement had enjoyed that inestimable advantage. They had become thoroughly imbued with the liberalizing influences, which, in spite of the despotism of Napoleon and the blind tyranny of the other Continental monarchs, still pervaded Europe. They felt their need of Western sympathy, their dependence on Western aid. They therefore, from considerations both of feeling and of policy, repudiated the bigoted exclusiveness of the Oriental Church, made in their early constitutions provision for the most absolute and complete religious liberty, and taught that the bond of national unity should be found rather in the sentiment of a generous patriotism, than in devotion to a religious confession. So long as the war of revolution lasted, so long as the want of European moral and material aid was felt, so long as Occidental Christendom continued to shed her blood and spend her gold in their behalf, the whole Greek people continued to share in these liberal sentiments, and the allied powers, in the treaties of 1830 and 1832, adopted from the Greek constitution then in force the enlightened principles of religious freedom which marked that instrument; and they solemnly guaranteed, not the liberty of conscience merely, but a perfect religious equality, as a fundamental condition of the existence of the new state. The unfortunate selection of an absolute sovereign in the person of a Catholic prince known to have been designed for the Church, and, though not yet tonsured, educated accordingly, but now unfrocked for the occasion, powerfully excited the jealousy of the Greek clergy, and roused again the dormant fanaticism of the people. Elementary instruction was at once monopolized by the ecclesiastics, and since 1843 they have had the entire control of the higher seminaries also, and thus all direct channels through which more catholic views could reach the popular mind have long since been effectually closed. The Greek legisla-

ture has not hitherto ventured to set the allied powers at open defiance, by enacting laws directly infringing the rights of conscience, but the constitution of 1843-44 shows a tendency to depart from the spirit of the treaties, and the religious liberties of Greece have been practically annihilated by the subserviency and corruption of the courts, which have solemnly adjudged that the bare public expression of dissent from the doctrines of the Oriental Church is, in and of itself, an infraction of a statute which forbids "attacking by malevolent expressions" the dogmas of *any* Christian church existing in Greece. Protestant and Catholic clergymen do indeed live in Greece, and the former, while prudently abstaining from the discussion of disputed points of Christian theology, or the expression of dissent from the "orthodox" creed, are even permitted to preach; but they cannot safely deny any article of that creed, or publicly expound and maintain the distinguishing doctrines of their own. The Catholics enjoy somewhat greater liberty at present. The fear of incurring the resentment of France, Bavaria, and Austria has hitherto restrained the Greek courts and populace from direct attempts to put down the ministers of the Romish Church; but they are regarded by both clergy and people with a hatred even more rancorous than that felt towards Protestants. No one who knows the temper of the Greek ecclesiastics can doubt that, whenever they feel themselves strong enough, in the countenance of Russia, to adopt more vigorous measures, Catholicism in Greece will suffer a persecution as unrelenting and as lawless as that of which Protestantism has hitherto been the subject.

The European advocates of the restoration of the Byzantine empire may learn something from the experimental test which has been for some time trying, in Greece proper, upon the capacity of the Greek race for existence in the form of an independent, social polity. That this experiment has thus far proved a total failure, and that none of the ends proposed, either by the charity of Christendom, or by the allies, in compelling the Porte to recognize the independence of Greece, have been realized, few will be hardy enough to deny. No works of physical improvement have been executed. The internal

police of the land is less efficient, and the life and property of the traveller are less secure, than under the Turkish rule. There is no productive industry, no exportation, and no commerce but the carrying trade. It is very doubtful whether there has been any increase of the population. The excess of births over deaths scarcely makes up for the constant emigration to other countries, and the loss of numbers by the removal of the Turkish population has not been compensated by any counter-current of immigration. Indeed, the last country an Ottoman Greek would select for his residence would be Greece, while, on the other hand, the superior advantages of Turkey are so obvious and so attractive, that it is confidently affirmed that there is usually a larger number of Hellenic subjects permanently residing at Constantinople than in Athens itself. What Greece might do under an enlightened, honest, and severe government, and with able and incorruptible legal tribunals, is a problem not likely to be soon experimentally solved. Doubtless, much of the pervading corruption of the land is to be ascribed to unfavorable external influences, among which Russian intrigue is the chief, and something to the unlucky chance which dropped a crown upon a head trained for the cardinal's hat, and too imbecile to wear either with dignity or credit. But still Greece is legally a liberal, constitutional state, and it argues great inaptitude for self-government, great weakness, or great demoralization, in the people who framed the constitution of 1843-44, to have suffered it in five years to become a dead letter, furnishing indeed, by its limitations of executive power, an apology for all the short-comings of the crown, but opposing no barrier to any of its encroachments upon the liberty of the subject. That constitution did indeed answer the real purpose of the principal movers of the revolution, which was to oust the Bavarian incumbents of office, and, as we say in America, to rotate themselves into their places. Unhappily, they dismissed one Bavarian too few; and if they had taken order that the first of that dynasty should have been also the last, and filled the throne with a sovereign worthy to guide an infant, and to rule a free nation, the maintenance of the constitution in its purity would have merited, and might have

called forth, a solicitude which thus far has never been manifested.

While insisting that the governing classes in Greece are politically less liberal and enlightened than their fathers, — the generation which achieved the revolution, — we admit that there are tokens of a wide-spread and rapid improvement among the people at large. They are remarkable for their avidity for instruction, the popular schools are largely attended, and it is touching to witness the zeal with which knowledge is sought, in spite of very discouraging obstacles. There is danger, no doubt, that this zeal may take a wrong direction, and it must be confessed that it is too apt to be satisfied with a humble range of acquirement. But, after all, light is pouring in through a thousand channels, and if once the prestige of Russian influence is dispelled, and the people can be roused to shake off the yoke of a bigoted and self-seeking priesthood, which, both in Turkey and in Greece, is still, as an old traveler described it two hundred years ago, composed chiefly of "men ignorant in letters, studious for the belly, and ignominiously lazy," there is abundant room to hope for the true regeneration of the Greek people.

Though widely dispersed, the ancient Armenian nation still exists as a pure and unmixed race. The Armenians are more numerous in Turkey than the Greeks, and probably do not fall short of 2,500,000. Intellectually, the Armenian is in advance of all other Turkish subjects, Christian or Mussulman, and his moral capacities and sensibilities appear to be suited to the reception of a high degree of culture. But, until the late reforms, his condition has been unfavorable to the development of the nobler qualities of either head or heart, and, like the Ottoman Greek, he has long too well exemplified the truth of the Homeric sentiment:

"Great Jove, upon the day
That makes proud man a slave, takes half his worth away."

The greatest defect in the character of the Armenian is the want of a virtue which the Greek must be admitted to possess, — courage, moral and physical; and it is a remarkable fact, that, from the Moslem conquest to the present day, the

Armenians have never taken part in any of the insurrections by which other subject races have shown their impatience of the Turkish yoke. They are a temperate, industrious, eminently thoughtful people, readily accessible to argument and instruction, and in a considerable degree free from the arrogant pride of the Greek, which scorns all foreign teaching as implying the superiority of the instructor, and finds nothing worthy of imitation in European life and learning but its vices and its frivolities.

The Armenians are unfortunately too few to exercise the weight which justly belongs to them as the superior race, in moulding the future destinies of Turkey. They do not constitute more than a fifteenth part of the population of the empire, and though more numerous in Armenia proper, they are too scattered in their abodes to have much of the strength which results from concentration of force, and unity of action. The Armenian community at Constantinople is indeed large, and it exerts a constantly increasing power in the administration of the government; but it is here more exposed to the mischievous corruptions of European intrigue, and less open to better influences than in the provincial districts, and it is somewhat weakened by the inroads which Popery has made upon it. It must be remembered, too, that by the treaties of *Turkmantschai* and *Adrianople* Russia acquired from Persia and Turkey large territories inhabited principally by Armenians, and including *Etschmiadzin*, the ancient religious metropolis of the nation. The possession of these provinces, of so large an Armenian population, and of pious establishments hallowed by the oldest Christian recollections of the race, is, in the hands of Russia, a powerful means of operating upon the national Church, and conciliating the sympathies of the people. It might seem, therefore, that the best interests of Turkey have more to fear than to hope from the influence of the most highly gifted class of her population; but the jealousy between the Armenians and the Greeks will go far to prevent the former from amalgamating with the professors of the creed which claims to be the exclusive expression of Oriental orthodoxy, and, on the other hand, the progress which Protestantism has already made among the Armenians encourages the belief

that, as a people, they will hold out against the strenuous efforts which Rome is now making to win them to the fold of that church which declares that within its pale alone is there a possibility of salvation.

The Armenians have been the readiest of the Orientals to adopt more enlightened principles of religious belief, and more liberal and progressive views of political action. In Turkey, they habitually use the language and follow the general habits and modes of life of the Osmanlis. They are faithful subjects of the same government, and are not suspected of any treacherous alliance or secret sympathy with the enemies of Turkey, or any ambitious views of national aggrandizement. They stand, therefore, in no hostile relation to the dominant race, have no conflicting general interests, and the Turks accordingly regard them with no political jealousy. Their community of language, the close analogy of their domestic institutions, and the similarity of their habits and characters to those of the Ottomans, create a certain fellowship between the two peoples, while the general intelligence and business capacity of the Armenians make them indispensable to the Turks, as the most competent and reliable agents in all public and private affairs requiring clerkly skill and administrative capacity. Thus becoming possessed of the most intimate knowledge of all Turkish interests, and commanding the most ready channels of access to the mind and heart of the Turkish people, they are the most influential medium through which the light of Christianity and the progressive spirit of the West can be made operative on the obsolete ideas and petrified forms of the Eastern world. The ultimate national character of Turkey, the form of its future Christian social and religious institutions, will be more freely and independently developed, and will assume a more harmonious adaptation to the cardinal and indelible features of Oriental humanity, under the guidance of native reformers and teachers, than if imposed and dictated by alien instructors, however enlightened. The Armenians, then, are best fitted by character and condition to be the ministers of Providence for the complete civilization and Christianization of the Ottoman people; and the religious charity of America has adopted a wise policy in bestowing upon them a large share of its efforts and its bounty.

The traditional opinions of Europe and America with respect to the character of the Turks have been founded partly on the misrepresentations of their natural enemies, the Greeks, and partly on the distorted and prejudiced views of Frank travellers, who were generally ignorant of the languages of the country, and usually remained too short a time in Turkey to contract any personal familiarity with the people, or to learn anything more of Turkish life than could be gathered from intercourse with the rapacious Janizaries who attended them, or other inferior persons with whom they have been brought into contact. Opinions formed under such circumstances are about as accurate as would be the impressions of a Mexican who should derive his notions of our own *morale* from the conduct of a certain class of our troops during the late war between the two republics, or those of a Chinese who should ascribe to the best circles of New York the ethics and the manners of the Celtic hackmen and Fernando Wood police of that metropolis. Gentlemanly and intelligent Ottomans are rather chary of their confidence towards Christian strangers, and an admission to familiar intercourse with the better classes of native society at Constantinople is not so easily secured as at our national capital, where foreign adventurers require no other credentials than bad English, mustaches, and brass, to be received with open arms by the *élite* of fashionable life. If we consult those admirable old travellers, Busbequius and Belon and Della Valle and Sandys, we shall find that the Turks, even at the period when they were regarded as the irreconcilable and dangerous enemies of Christian Europe, were by no means the barbarous and inhuman savages that religious enmity has made them. Modern observers, who, like Hamilton and Fellowes, have spent any considerable length of time in the Asiatic provinces of Turkey, express equally favorable opinions, and few intelligent foreigners reside long in any part of the empire without adopting similar conclusions. To Christendom generally the Osmanli is known only through enemies and strangers. The lion has not yet been the painter. Turkey is still to be heard in her own defence, and when her literary artists shall take the pencil, who can tell what a picture of Christian duplicity,

depravity, and crime they may hold up before us! If Turkey has often wronged the Christians, she has been often outraged by them. She has indeed used cruelty in suppressing insurrections, but let Poland and Hungary and Lombardy say whether the insurgent subjects of apostolic Cæsars have not, in our own times, been punished with equally remorseless severity. The atrocities committed by the Turkish troops during the war of the Greek Revolution have been the theme of well-merited execration; but if we condemn the Moslems for barbarities exercised in waging a recognized warfare, what shall we say of those Greek "sympathizers," who in 1854, at the personal instigation of the king and queen of Greece, entered the territory of a state with which their own government was at peace, attacked a village inhabited by Mussulmans and Christians, and burned a church of their own religion, a temple consecrated to the God of Peace, and with it two hundred unoffending Turkish men, women, and children, who had fled to it for refuge, in the vain hope that the sacredness of the house of the Christian God would protect them against the murderous violence of the worshippers of that God!

Various circumstances have in recent times contributed essentially to modify the objectionable features of the Turkish character. Independently of legal reforms, the most important of these circumstances are the suppression of the Janizaries, and the disbanding of the Arnaout or Albanian troops, two corps of bloody and brutal soldiery, to whose ferocity most of the violent excesses which have disgraced the Turkish name are chargeable. The Arnaouts, a large proportion of whom were nominal Christians of the Greek Church, were much more sanguinary and undisciplined than the Janizaries; but they are no longer employed in separate corps, and the Janizaries were suppressed—exterminated, we may say,—by Mahmoud, in 1826, as the Memlouks in Egypt, a very similar corps, had been by Mehemet Ali long before. The Janizaries, who formerly constituted the only proper standing army of the empire, and who were employed both as a police and as a technical soldiery, were composed, to a great extent, of men who had been taken from their families, Turkish and Christian, indiscriminately, in very early life, and trained up

to the military profession from the beginning. They were, like the Romish priesthood, completely detached from all the ties of family and of blood, and knew no home but the quarters of their regiment, no duties but those of military service and executive police. The dissolution of this turbulent body, which was as dangerous to the authority of the Sultan as to the personal rights of the subject, has removed the display of arbitrary violence which formerly accompanied almost every exercise of governmental authority, and the people of Constantinople are now much less under the dominion of physical force than the citizens of Paris. The Turk is habitually calm and unexcitable. He has no predisposition to violence, and, though it may be a startling proposition to many, we speak advisedly when we say that there is not in Europe or America a community of four hundred thousand souls among whom there is so little of crime, so little disregard of positive law, as among the four hundred thousand Mussulman inhabitants of Stamboul. While the suburbs of that city—inhabited in great part by so-called Christians, Greeks, Maltese, Ionian-Islanders, and European political refugees and fugitives from justice—are the theatre of more robberies, burglaries, assassinations, and forcible outrages of every description, than perhaps any other city in the world, the rights of person and property are nowhere more secure from lawless violence than in the Turkish quarters of the Ottoman capital. In virtue of old treaties with the European states, Franks residing or travelling in Turkey are in general exempt from the jurisdiction of the Turkish criminal tribunals. The Christian governments have provided no adequate means of repressing or punishing the crimes of their subjects and *protégés* at Constantinople, and of course it is quite impossible for the Porte to maintain any effective police in the suburbs inhabited by Franks. Thus neither the Ottoman people nor their government are in any way responsible for the perpetration or the impunity of the criminal violences so frequent in those parts of Constantinople with which foreign travellers are most familiar.

In their domestic relations, in their treatment of children, of their slaves and other servants, and of brute animals, the Turks are extremely gentle and indulgent. Towards each

other they very seldom use personal violence, or even abusive language. Ladies, women indeed of all classes, so far from being confined to what is called "the seclusion of the harem," are as free in all points except social intercourse with the other sex, and they practically make quite as great a use of their freedom, as the women of any Christian country; and polygamy, though sanctioned by the Koran, and therefore a legal relation, was never general, and is now so rare that it may fairly be said to be quite obsolete.

The relation of master and servant is one of the greatest mildness, and, the slave-trade being now forbidden by law, slavery will soon cease to exist in the Ottoman empire. The slave is treated as a child, and his prospects of rising in life are in no degree prejudiced by his dependent condition. Two of the brothers-in-law of the present Sultan were slaves, and a very aged and distinguished pacha, himself originally bought in the market, told the writer of this article, a few years since, that at his last preceding birthday he received visits from more than twenty pachas who had been his own slaves.

The Turk is naturally full of moral and physical courage, sober, temperate, eminently self-respecting, reverent, sincere in his devotion, no less to the spirit of his religion than to its outward forms; but these admirable qualities have been sadly alloyed by too much "evil communication" with the base morality of his Christian subjects, of whose superior practical intelligence his inaptitude for the acquirement of the liberal arts has constantly forced him to avail himself. While, therefore, he has lost some of his primitive virtues, he has contracted not a few of the vices which have always characterized the populations of Eastern Europe and Western Asia, and the inherent defects of his character have been rendered more palpable and conspicuous by the strong contrasts between his habits and institutions and those of the swiftly progressive Christian civilization with which he has been brought so closely in contact. The Ottomans, though of Asiatic origin, do not belong to the group of nations whose moral, intellectual, and social characteristics we have combined into an imaginary unity which we style the Oriental type, and in fact the Turk has nothing in common with the supposed Oriental

of European romance but the traits derived from the nomad habits of his Tatar ancestors, which correspond with the character that similar conditions have developed in the Beduin, and indeed in all pastoral tribes. The Arab, Persian, and Syrian races, from which our popular ideas of Oriental life and character have been derived, have been too little intermixed with the Turks to have much claim to consideration as important elements in Ottoman ethnology; and it must further be remembered, that very generally at Constantinople, and indeed among the wealthy classes everywhere in Turkey, the Tatar blood has been in a very considerable degree eliminated by constant intermarriage with women from Circassia, Georgia, and other Caucasian districts. But we go even further than this, and affirm that the mass of the present Mussulman population of Europe and Asia Minor has very little ethnological connection with the Tatar stock. The Moslems of European Turkey are in an immense proportion descended from the Greek, the Bulgarian, and the mixed tribes of the Danubian valley, in which the Slavic blood predominates; and it is equally true, that in Asia Minor the largest share of the Mohammedan population traces its origin to a Christian ancestry. Oriental, therefore, in the popular sense, the Turk is not, and it may safely be maintained that, in its ordinary acceptation, this epithet is at the present moment as justly applicable to the character and habits of the population of Southeastern Spain as to those of the Mussulmans of Turkey.

Mohammedanism, like Popery, makes no concessions, and, like it, demands complete conformity, without regard to difference of conditions, and that too at the cost, if need be, of every principle of spontaneous life and distinctive national character. Rigid Islamism is suited only to a patriarchal nomad existence, and its proper home is the desert. The civic splendors of the Khalifat of Bagdad, and the Ommeyade and Almoravide dynasties in Spain, were won, not by, but in spite of the tendencies of the Prophet's doctrines, and the greatest Mussulman princes have been those who suffered themselves to be least shackled by the restraints of an unsocial religion. The Turkish tribes adopted Islamism before they relinquished

their habits of wandering life, and when they established themselves in fixed abodes, and began to feel the want of a regular administrative and social organization, the creation of appropriate political and civil institutions was obstructed by a religious system which paralyzed their energies, and trammelled the free development of their native powers. Hence, instead of a social polity growing out of, and adapted to, the national character and condition of the Ottoman people, the Turks have adopted the institutions of the races they conquered, and contented themselves with the religious establishment of the Arabs, and the political organization of the Lower Empire. The conquest of Constantinople was but a change of dynasty. The court of the Byzantine emperors served as a model for that of the successors of Mohammed, and the eunuch and the bow-string, popularly supposed to be exclusively characteristic of the seraglio, played as important a part in the palace intrigues of Christian Constantinople as is those of Ottoman Stamboul. The municipal corporations of Turkey are organized and administered precisely as they were centuries before the conquest; the public revenue is levied and collected substantially in the ancient fashion, and even the traveller's firman, now indeed little else than a passport, was in its original and more efficient form but a copy of the old imperial diploma. Finding thus all — first religion, then forms of state, finance, municipal order, mechanical art — ready organized to his hands, it is not strange that the barbarian, suddenly emerging from nomad into stable life, and with no theological creed, no social institutions, of his own, should have accepted the establishments which the long experience of his newly won subjects had cemented. If, therefore, the conquest of Constantinople had preceded the triumphs of the Turks over a Mohammedan nation, when, as Fuller says, "having conquered the Saracens by their valor, they were themselves subdued by the Saracen superstition," there is little room for doubt, that, like the Bulgarian and Avar invaders of the Danubian valley, they would soon have adopted the faith, as they did the governmental forms, the vices, and the corruptions, of the great imperial capital.

It is natural that, under such circumstances, the construct-

ive faculty should never have been developed in the Ottoman Turk, and that, having taken the Arab and the Greek as the architects of his social fabric, he should employ them and other strangers as the builders of his material structures, and the engineers in his works of physical improvement. In politics, science, art, he has effected little, created nothing; and the deviations of his governmental and industrial establishments from the models after which they were fashioned, have been purely the fruit of accidental circumstances, not the results of conventional system or of any consciously recognized principle of action. Administrative talent, however, the Turks have never wanted, and since the introduction of the Tanzimat or reformed policy, it must be admitted that, in carrying out the scheme of centralization, which is a prominent feature of the Tanzimat, as a necessary preparation for the practical application of its beneficent principles, the Porte has shown a perseverance, a consistency, a capacity of adherence to a settled plan, a tendency to organization, in fact, which is quite a new trait in Ottoman social and intellectual development. So far, then, at least, Turkey has given proof of a power of assimilation to theoretically regular political system, and therefore of indefinite social improvement.

If the Turks are not a creative people, neither are they, as is so generally supposed, characterized especially by wantonly destructive propensities. That they habitually suffer existing constructions to dilapidate and perish for want of foresight in preventing decay, and of care in repairing the wear and tear which all things human necessarily undergo, is sufficiently true; but the dearth of ancient monuments at Constantinople, and the frequent demolition of heathen temples by Turks, are by no means sufficient to establish the charge of the love of ruin for ruin's sake. We know, historically, that a large proportion of the works of ancient art, in which Constantinople was once so rich, perished in the destructive fires that almost desolated the city in the sixth, seventh, and following centuries, and that those which remained were nearly all carried off, melted up, or shattered to fragments, by the Crusaders who, under "blind old Dandolo," sacked Constantinople in 1204. When, therefore, the Turks took possession of the imperial

capital, they found little to destroy. If, in their iconoclastic zeal, they sometimes mutilated a statue or a picture, they had good precedents, Protestant and Papal, for thus testifying their hatred of idolatry, and in pulling down a temple or a church to build a mosque with its materials, they were but imitating Justinian, who despoiled the temples of the Sun at Baalbec, and of Diana at Ephesus, to decorate the Church of Santa Sophia.

One of the most common, and perhaps well-grounded, charges against the Turks, is that of indolence. But this is more properly applicable to the inhabitants of Constantinople and its environs; and it is more or less true of the population of all political capitals. The soil of the borders of the Bosphorus, and indeed of Turkey in general, offers little encouragement for agricultural labor, except to the very few who possess a sufficient amount of capital to command facilities for irrigation, which the long-continued droughts of summer render indispensable to successful husbandry. For commerce the Turk has little aptitude, being, as an old traveller observes, "a fool in that kind, and easily cozened." He leaves, therefore, the mystery of buying cheap and selling dear to the crafty Armenian, the cogging Jew, and in still larger measure to the Chiote sharper, to whom the shrewdest Yorkshireman or Yankee is but a tyro. Mechanical industry, once so flourishing in the Levant, is at a low ebb; but the cause of its decay lies less in the character of the people than in the commercial regulations into which Turkey has been duped by the cunning of European diplomacy. By the first commercial treaty between the Porte and a Christian sovereign, Francis the First of France, it was stipulated that no more than three per cent *ad valorem* should be levied on the importation of French wares into Turkey. To this is added a duty of two per cent when the goods are sent into the interior for sale, so that the total amount imposed upon them is five per cent. Other powers afterwards claimed the benefit of a similar arrangement, and no merchandise imported from any Christian country now pays more than five per cent. A tariff like this scarcely defrays the cost of collection, and the Porte has been compelled, in order to raise an adequate revenue, to impose

heavy taxes on real estate, and every branch of productive industry, and to levy export duties, amounting in all to twelve per cent, on all goods sent abroad from Turkey. With so little protection against foreign competition, and such heavy domestic burdens, no manufacturing industry, especially among a people little advanced in mechanical appliances, can possibly sustain itself, and the manufactures of Turkey have consequently almost ceased to exist. Like the poet Thomson, when urged at noonday to rise and bestir himself, the Turk may well reply that he has "no motive," and he quietly allows the restless energy and the comparatively abundant capital of the Greek and the Frank to monopolize the profits of the productive industry and the gainful traffic of the empire.

To all these causes of discouragement we must add the important fact that the Turks, as a people, have become hopeless with regard to the prospects of their country, their race, and their religion. They are conscious of a present inability to assimilate themselves to those forms of life in which alone great progress and high attainment in social excellence are possible. They are growing more and more aware that their system of social and political organization cannot long subsist, in contact with that restless and ever-advancing element of civilization which the Gothic and Germanic tribes have infused into the Romance, and even the Celtic and Slavic families, and they are half ready to admit themselves to be little better than intruders in Europe. Political hope is the pabulum of patriotism. Where hope has ceased to be cherished, we seek in vain the exalted sentiment of an expansive and comprehensive love of country, and we ought not, therefore, to be surprised to find among the Ottomans a political corruption, against which a generous and enlightened patriotism is the only safeguard.

The bane of Turkey is venality and corruption in office. A Turkish judge may perhaps "sell justice" as freely as did a British Lord Chancellor two hundred years ago, and Orientals who would scorn a fraud in weight or measure are sometimes quite ready to finger a bribe. But the difference between the Moslem and the Christian in this respect, we fear,

is rather in the name and objects of corruption than in substance. Bribe is an unsavory word to "Christian" ears, and, besides, liberal official emoluments and great private fortunes place the incumbents of important offices in European civil hierarchies above the temptation of such gratifications as private individuals can afford to pay. We accomplish equivocal ends by different appliances, and we excuse the little accommodations between the twofold conscience of the officer and the man, upon the ground of what is euphemistically styled a recognized and allowable distinction between public and private morality. "Convey the wise it call. Steal! foh; a fico for the phrase!"

The pride and pelf of office have so benumbed what old ethical writers call the *synteresis* of Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham, that they glory in the shame of opening private letters, betraying the correspondence to Continental despots, and sternly consigning the writers to an ignominious death; but if the baronet were unofficially intrusted, by a litigant in an English court, with a letter to his attorney, we do not suppose the offer of a shilling, though as "splendid" as Phillips's, would induce him to open the missive, or that, if he were unable to resist the temptation, Lord Aberdeen would volunteer to communicate its contents to the opposite party. Every nation has its pet mode of cheating its own conscience, and, corruption for corruption, we see no reason to believe that Turkey would at all suffer by comparison with that Northern neighbor of hers, to which Ledyard's characteristic epithet "unprincipled" will cling for centuries. At any rate, Turkish colonels do not receive pay, rations, and clothing for more thousands of soldiers than they can muster hundreds, nor do Turkish naval officers habitually eke out the deficiency of their pay by selling the Sultan's cables and anchors.

Although the Koran furnishes abundant evidence that its author was at least partially acquainted with the history and the principles of the Christian religion, yet we can by no means agree with those who think that Islamism is founded on the New Testament, and who in fact regard it as a species of Christianity *minus* Christ. It is far more nearly

allied to Judaism, or perhaps we should rather say to that earlier and more widely diffused form of Theism, which existed among the Semitic tribes before the Hebrew period, and may be considered as having been incorporated into the Jewish dispensation. The primeval religion of Arabia has left no record but the books of Genesis and Job and the other Scriptural notices of patriarchal life, and we know little of its ethical character, except as its moral precepts were recognized and embodied in the Mosaic law. Between these precepts and those of the Koran the accordance is so close, that Judaism and Islamism may be considered ethically identical, and the most important differences between the two religions are purely ritual. Considered as a policy, Mahommedanism is more available for the protection of the individual than is generally supposed. Turkey has had many violent and arbitrary princes, who would tolerate no claim of limitation to their power; but in theory, and at present in practice, the Sultan is by no means absolute. Although, therefore, he is regarded with great reverence and devotion, and his firmans are usually obeyed without question as to their binding authority, yet the loyalty of the Turk is not of so personally degrading a character as the abject, crawling submission with which the Muscovite receives the ukase of the Czar, nor does the Moslem, like the Russian, elevate his sovereign to the rank of God's representative and vicegerent upon earth. In many cases of a civil and political character, the formal assent of the highest ecclesiastical authority, which is at once the supreme judiciary and the head of the church, is required, and the arbitrary will of a Sultan has more than once found a firm resistance on the part of the doctors of civil and religious law.

Without here entering into a more minute analysis of Islamism, or specially pointing out the inconsistency of its institutions with the spirit of modern society, or with any high degree of social culture, we may say that we do not consider the regeneration of Turkey, in the sense in which that phrase is commonly understood,—the restoration, namely, of the scimitar and the bow-string,—as either desirable or practicable. Nor do we believe that the Ottoman empire

can maintain its integrity and recover its political weight by any other means than the general adoption of Christianity by its people. A Jewish commonwealth, adhering strictly to the ordinances and observances of the Pentateuch, could, in the present state of the world, neither acquire political importance nor long maintain an independent existence, unless, like China, it were territorially widely separated from the European continent. There is the same impracticability in the re-establishment of the Osmanlis as a great political state, or a truly civilized and cultivated people. In fact, the Jews as a nation never rose to a condition of elevated general culture. They had no popular, perhaps no profane, literature; they patronized neither science nor liberal art; they exerted no wide-spread influence in the development of the higher powers of the human intellect; and they left behind them no monuments of material greatness. The Saracens, indeed, under the early Caliphs, and, at a later period, under the native Mussulman princes of Spain, perfected a civilization, and attained a moral and intellectual culture, whose great superiority over the contemporaneous social and mental life of Christendom is but just now beginning to be appreciated; but it was mainly through their self-emancipation from the more embarrassing restraints of rigid Islamism, that they were able to achieve these triumphs. While Papal Europe was sunk in the semi-barbarism of the Middle Ages, the religion and the civil institutions of Islam, as expounded and administered by the Arab and Moorish doctors and princes of Mesopotamia and Spain, were better suited to advance the great interests of humanity than the debased Christianity of the time, or than the grovelling feticism which at this day gathers King Bomba and his lazzaroni around the shrine of San Gennaro, and brings thousands to pay their oblations to the blinking Madonna of Rimini and the Holy Coat of Treves. But the progress of which the Reformation was the harbinger and the instrument has long since passed the utmost goal to which Mohammedan civilization could possibly attain, and neither the political nor the social institutions of Islamism can long subsist in contact with hostile influences of so aggressive and so mighty a character as those

which animate the political and social life of Christian Europe. In our time, to use a French phrase which Kossuth's quaint translation of it has made popular, "the solidarity of the peoples" — the doctrine that mankind compose a family, each member of which is bound to all the rest by sacred rights and duties, so that, without incurring the guilt of Cain, none can say, "Am I my brother's keeper?" — is too universally recognized long to permit the existence of commonwealths so exclusive and so independent as the Moslem and Jewish states.

The adoption of Christianity by Moslem nations is attended with great practical difficulties, because it involves, not only a change in their theology, but a complete revolution in the state, in the judiciary, in every branch of social, and almost every feature of domestic life. To the Mussulman the Koran is what the Pentateuch was to the Hebrew, — at once the gospel of his religion, the constitution of his government, the *magna charta* of his liberties, the statute which defines his civil and his personal rights, the code which prescribes and regulates his social and domestic duties. The patriotic Turk, therefore, though tolerant towards others, is himself almost necessarily a bigot, and this not so much from a blind and selfish partiality for the spiritual side of his religion, as from a belief that all his national institutions and all his temporal interests are founded on and bound up with it. Hence a conviction of the necessity of a radical change in the framework of the temporal commonwealth is an indispensable prerequisite to all preparation for the reception of a new spiritual dispensation, and Mohammedanism is destined to fall by blows directed against it as a civil polity, rather than as a theological system. There is no doubt that such a conviction is already widely entertained among the more enlightened orders of the Ottoman empire, and it promises to become, within a reasonable period, general among the people. The political considerations connected with the introduction of Christianity address themselves indeed almost exclusively to the governing class, which alone is sufficiently acquainted with foreign politics to comprehend the necessity of the assimilation of Turkish institutions to the European model, or sufficiently instructed

to appreciate the mutual interdependence of their religion and their social life; but other influences of a properly religious character are actively at work upon the mass of the people. In latter years, Christianity, which, judged by the apparent character of its rites in the Catholic and Oriental Churches, and by its practical influence on the lives of its professors in the East, has been, with too much reason, regarded as little better than a modern adaptation of old idolatries, is now presented to the Moslem in purer forms. The Bible has been translated into the Turkish language. It is publicly sold in the bazaars and streets of Constantinople, and it is read, to no inconsiderable extent, by Turkish men and Turkish women. The moral and intellectual tendencies of its doctrines have been exemplified, with powerful effect, in the superior intelligence and the higher morality of those Oriental Christians who have accepted the instruction of Western teachers, and a general spirit of liberalism and of inquiry has been awakened among the Ottoman people. Complete and absolute religious toleration, which, to the shame of Christianity, is denied in so many European and American states, has long existed in Turkey; but the change in the feeling of the Moslems is recent, and some of its most striking evidences have occurred since the conclusion of the peace with Russia. It is indeed a striking proof of the wisdom of that Providence which overrules the wickedness of man for purposes of moral and spiritual good, that a war, undertaken, in part at least, for the criminal purpose of checking the spread of a liberal and enlightened Christianity in the East, should have been made instrumental to the advancement of the very object it sought to defeat. It is a remarkable, though natural, feature of the spirit of inquiry now awakened in Turkey, that it is directed to the inherent character of the Christian religion, as soon as the attention of the observer is drawn to the superiority of the civil and domestic institutions of Western Europe. We say this is natural with a Mussulman, because with him religion is the substructure of the whole social edifice, and he is therefore prone to regard it as the necessary basis of every civil polity, to seek in it the ruling principle of all that appertains to associate, or to individual, moral, intellectual, and spiritual

life. Thus Christianity in Turkey appeals alike to the statesman, the political economist, the social reformer, the patriot who grieves over the decaying greatness of his country, the philosophic inquirer after spiritual truth, and the humbler and less reflecting Mussulman who seeks deliverance from social and material evils that threaten soon to become intolerable.

In spite, then, of the obstacles which oppose the Christianization of Turkey, we have an abiding faith, that this great object will ultimately be realized, and we are even convinced that, but for the active opposition of certain European powers, the change would be effected with comparative rapidity.

To those who have not studied the Oriental question at the sources, it may seem incredible and paradoxical that the spread of Christianity in Turkey should be obstructed by Christian intrigue, but the fact is, nevertheless, unquestionable; and it is certain that powerful European influences have, for half a century, been constantly arrayed against every plan of improvement in Turkey, whether material, social, moral, or religious; and the Ottoman reformers have found their most formidable obstacles, not in the obstinate prejudices of the Turkish people, but in the intrigues of Christian powers, which have preferred rather to sacrifice the best interests of even the Christian subjects of the Porte, than to allow the Ottoman government to strengthen itself in the affections of its people by a liberal, just, wise, and beneficent course of public policy. The European states whose territories lie contiguous to those of Turkey have several motives for resisting the progress of reform in that empire; but the great and leading one is to prevent such a strengthening and consolidation of the Ottoman commonwealth as would enable it to bid defiance to their schemes of partition and plunder. Every measure designed to harmonize the different races and religions of the empire, and especially those which tend to attach the Christian subjects of the Porte to their own government, or which, by diffusing a liberal and enlightened Christianity among the Turks themselves, would lead to a final amalgamation of the whole population, and the establishment of a great, free, Christian state under the rule of one independent national government, is of course dangerous to the ambitious

and rapacious schemes of the powers to which we have alluded, and is accordingly resisted by all the arts of political corruption and intrigue. The Greek Revolution, which once threatened, if not the overthrow of the Ottoman dynasty, the erection of a powerful democracy on the shores of the Mediterranean, was always discouraged by Austria, and by Russia also, until, in spite of their intrigues, the armed intervention of England became certain. Then, indeed, they interfered, but only for the purpose of securing a monarchical constitution, and a supple tool in the crowned weakling whom, after they had cunningly dissuaded Leopold from accepting the sovereignty, they placed upon a throne hardly more exalted than the three-legged stool on which King Alcinous

οἰνοπόταζεν ἐφήμενος ἀθάνατος ὧς.

In the same spirit, these powers have perseveringly opposed every reform calculated in any way to better the condition of the Christian subjects whom the severance of Greece left to the Porte, and thereby to rally them in support of a government to which both gratitude and self-interest would attach them. Nor have Russia and Austria been by any means without aid in these philanthropic efforts. Notwithstanding the bitter hostility between the Catholic and the Oriental Churches, there has always been a great deal of amiable coquetry between their respective heads, the successor of Peter and the Russian autocrat. If they sometimes scold, they as often bill and coo, and they are ever ready to lend each other a helping hand in any question of dynastic or pontifical interests.* Thus, when Clement XIV., in reluctant obedience to the voice of the Catholic Church itself, suppressed the Jesuits,

* So strong is the *esprit de corps* among despots, that the Turkish sultans themselves have never experienced any difficulty in effecting a reasonable arrangement with Majesties and Holinesses, whenever they have needed imperial or papal aid in the perpetration of great crimes on Christian soil. Thus Francis II. entrapped Rhigas, the first apostle of the liberties of Greece, and surrendered him to the Ottoman authorities. Innocent VIII. and Alexander VI. were successively hired by Bayezid II. to detain in captivity his accomplished brother and rival, Prince Zizim, who had fled to the Knights of Rhodes for sanctuary; and when Alexander sold his prisoner to Charles VIII., he, with exemplary and truly pontifical fidelity to the spirit of his engagement with the Sultan, administered to the prince a fatal poison, after the receipt of the price, but before the delivery of Zizim to the king.

whose political and moral corruption had rendered them the abomination of Western Europe, they were received by the Empress of Russia, and allowed to maintain their organization in the Russian dominions, until the overthrow of Napoleon and the general assent of the allied powers enabled Pius VII. openly to recognize and formally restore a society which constitutes the most powerful stay of the Papacy, and the most dangerous engine ever wielded by the enemies of civil and religious liberty. The important service which Russia thus rendered to the Papal cause was repaid, during the Polish insurrection and the troubles which preceded and caused it, by the zealous and efficient support which the functionaries of the Romish Church gave to the authority of the Czar, even when his forcible proselytism of Polish Catholics to the Greek Church was the cause of resistance to his tyranny. The Jesuits, and other emissaries of Catholicism in Greece and Turkey, are as zealous in opposing the progress of Protestantism among the Greeks and Armenians, and the toleration of the Protestant religion by the Turks, as they would be in resisting the conversion of native-born Catholics, and the Emperor of Russia finds a Jesuit missionary as devoted an agent as a Greek Pappas.

Such, then, are the mighty obstacles with which the spirit of Christian reform has to contend in the great work of the regeneration of Turkey. How they have been thus far met, and what ground there is for hope that they may yet be overcome, we shall endeavor to set forth in a future article.

ART. VII.—BANCROFT'S AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The American Revolution. By GEORGE BANCROFT. Vol. I. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co.

THE European political economists used to suppose that the pioneers in a new country of course chose the best land in it, as they had the first privilege. They supposed that

after-comers must necessarily work poorer soils. Our learned countryman, Mr. Carey, disproved this whole assumption, and, by doing so, upset half of the written science of political economy. He explains that pioneers choose the soil which is easiest reached and easiest cleared. And he shows that in fact, in almost all instances, the strongest and most productive land is that last brought under culture.

Very much the same thing is true in the cultivation of the domain of History. In regard to this, there is a vulgar prejudice that contemporaries are the best judges of the history of their time. This is quite a mistaken notion. They are, of course, the only authorities. But they are isolated authorities. And they cannot command so many different points of view, or so many threads of motive, as to state comprehensively what have been the really vital and organic movements of the transactions which they describe. Contemporaries are the best of annalists, as they are the only diarists. But they are not the best historians. The duty of surveying the whole body of events, and of assigning to each its proper place and dignity, is a duty for their successors of two or three generations following, or even of a more distant posterity. This statement will appear no paradox to the man who will apply it fairly to his own knowledge of his own times. Is there, for instance, any reader of these pages who will profess to tell the immediate arrangements and combinations which led to the nominations of Mr. Buchanan or Colonel Fremont as candidates for the Presidency? No, Mr. Manager! do not claim that you know the whole story! At another hotel in another street there was another Mr. Manager, who was making his combinations too; he does not know that you were his ally, more than you know that he was yours. A hundred years hence, however, if posterity cares enough for us, it will have the trunks of old letters and papers from which to spin out the whole story, and posterity will know what we do not know, why this king's pawn did not advance that day, and whose knight it was that held him idly fixed upon the board.

It happens that the original express despatch is still extant which roused the Colonies to a blaze after the battle of Lexington. It sped from point to point with all the rapidity

which those simple times knew how to give. It left Wallingford in Connecticut on the 24th of April; it was in Charleston, South Carolina, on the 11th of May. It is hard to read the little indorsements on that despatch without tears, — so intense is their exhibition of the eagerness of the country and of its dislocated weakness. "Night and day to be forwarded." "For God's sake send the man on without the least delay!" "I request, for the good of our country, and the welfare of our lives and liberties and fortune, you will not lose a moment's time." Such are a few of them. The fatal paper thus worked its way along. Day and night reeking horses bore men hoarse with shouting war, along those unfrequented bridle-paths which marked the route from Province to Province. Men left their ploughs in the furrows, as it saluted them. It found ten Colonies hoping for peace. It left ten States preparing for war. And then it rested. It lay in some pigeon-hole of Drayton's till the nation became curious as to the struggle of agony in which it was born, and then it came to light again.

Now, as we read that critical message to-day, it is to see that, strictly speaking, not one word of it is true! The fact is as completely overlaid by exaggeration and imagination, as the fact is in any first telegraphic announcement of a collision in Kansas, by the time it reaches us upon the seaboard. The despatch is in these words: —

"Wallingford, Monday, April 24, 1775.

"DEAR SIR:— Colonel *Wadsworth* was over in this place most of yesterday, and has ordered twenty men out of each company in his regiment, some of which had already set off, and others go this morning. He brings accounts, which came to him authenticated, from *Thursday* in the afternoon. The King's troops being reinforced a second time, and joined, as I suppose, from what I can learn, by the party who were intercepted by Colonel *Gardner*, were then encamped on *Winter Hill*, and were surrounded by twenty thousand of our men who were intrenching. Colonel *Gardner's* ambush proved fatal to Lord *Percy* and another general officer, who were killed on the spot the first fire. To counterbalance this good news, the story is, that our first man in command (who he is I know not) is also killed. It seems they have lost many men on both sides; Colonel *Wadsworth* had the account in a letter from *Hartford*.

"I am, in the greatest haste, your entire friend and humble servant,
"JAMES LOCKWOOD."

"N. B. Colonel *Gardner* took nine prisoners, and twelve clubbed their firelocks, and came over to our party. Colonel *Gardner's* party consisted of seven hundred men, and the Regulars one thousand eight hundred, instead of one thousand two hundred, as we heard before. They have sent a vessel up *Mystick* River as far as *Temple's* farm, which is about half a mile from *Winter Hill*. These accounts being true, all the King's forces, except four or five hundred, must be encamped on *Winter Hill*."

That was the whole story. And it did its work. But we know now, that every statement here given as to the battle, unless we except the numbers of the English troops, was false. The king's troops were *not* reinforced a second time. Colonel *Gardner* (by whom is meant Isaac *Gardner* of Brookline) had *not* intercepted anybody. *None* of the king's troops encamped on *Winter Hill*, or even set foot upon it during the day. *None* of the Americans surrounded them there,—nor did any of them intrench anywhere all that day. Lord *Percy* was *not* killed, nor any other general officer. The first man in command on the American side (who he is *we* know not) was *not* killed either. Colonel *Gardner* did *not* take nine prisoners, nor did any English club their firelocks and come over to the Americans. Such is contemporary history, as recorded a hundred and fifty miles from the scene of action, and as it goes forth to kindle the fires of a war!

It is the business, as we have said, of the historian of the succeeding century, who can judge of the actors' characters, and—which is more important—of the characters of the men who leave the records of the actors, to go over the ground, to pick up the fragments and clean them, and to set up the temple anew. Mr. Bancroft has had this thing to do. He is the first historian of the Revolution who had anything like adequate material for doing it thoroughly. He has collected with diligence, putting both continents under contribution. His reputation is established, and he has received the voluntary tributes of special students or of local authorities. Any man in our generation can work in this field, with

a certain freedom from the personal prejudices which no man could escape in Ramsay's time or Judge Marshall's. Any American, again, can work in it as it is impossible for a foreigner, like Botta or Grahame, to do. And, with every year, the local histories and monographs, the choicest food for the general historian, multiply upon us, and fit distinctly so many little separate landmarks, all over the great chart;—so that with every year his work is the more certain, though all the more laborious. But, besides these general advantages, which Mr. Bancroft shares with other American students, he brings to his work all the affluence and wonderful vivacity of his style,—which seems to improve with every volume. To this he adds a rare gift for detecting real, though remote causes,—which shows him, when he comes upon a green, blossoming event, just where to look for the long, underground sucker which connects it with the parent stock from which it grew. Then there is his passion for bold reference to great principles as the sources of action,—which never permits him to rest satisfied with the vulgar solutions given to great problems in history, even by the most of the men who stand by, and see them in progress before their eyes.

The most striking of the novelties which are thus introduced into the systematic history of the country, is the view of King George as the prime mover of the English system of oppression. It was the policy of the American statesmen, at the opening of the war, to maintain always the constitutional salvo, and to charge on the ministry the decrees against which they rebelled, while they affected the greatest loyalty to the king. The English Constitution was still so new, and the old English Whig policy was in itself so popular, that they were specially tempted to try, in this way, to save their loyalty. We are disposed to believe that, at first, most of our statesmen really supposed the king an innocent puppet in the hands of his advisers. The war was well advanced, before his name was generally treated here with disrespect; and the habit of speaking of the English policy as the "ministerial policy," or as "North's policy," is not wholly abandoned to this day. But the last ten years have removed any obscurity which may have hung over this matter. It is certain now that

there was no Constable behind the throne, but that there was a king behind the minister. George the Third, young, popular, ignorant, and obstinate, was trying to govern his Colonies in an entirely unconstitutional way. It was his first experiment in autocracy. Fortunately for the constitution of Great Britain, it turned out very unsuccessfully, and was his last. While the Colonists were hanging Bute and North in effigy, while they were professing their undying loyalty to the king, it was the king himself who was driving now Bute and now North up to measures which they themselves distrusted. The king was trying to govern England as Alexander governs Russia. The attempt met with such indifferent success that it has not, on that scale, been repeated.

Mr. Bancroft, therefore, recasts all the history of the English causes of the outbreak, and with great gusto gives the king at last his due. Of course this view is far more picturesque and epigrammatic than that to which we are accustomed in modern history. The dulness of the history of constitutional nations comes from the exceeding difficulty of placing the responsibility anywhere. Mr. Bancroft, in this history of an unconstitutional monarch, is able to concentrate it on him; and he does not mince his words. "George the Third liked his pliant minister too well to give him up." "His heart was hardened." "He raved at the wise counsels of the greatest statesman of his dominions." "He never once harbored the thought of concession." "The inflexible king overruled Lord North." In Chapter XXIV., which is a very curious study of public opinion in England just before the beginning of war with America, the author shows us the general drift of the impression which had been given there. In speaking of Samuel Johnson, "the bravo who loves his trade," he says: "He echoed to the crowd the haughty rancor which passed down from the king and his court to the Council, to the ministers, to the aristocracy." In short, we believe we may justly say, that there is no place where he has an opportunity to speak of George the Third, in which he does not speak of him with contempt or with sarcasm.

The study of the French archives gave a great deal of curious illustration and information to the fifth and sixth

volumes of Mr. Bancroft's History. It does to the volume before us. We have already said, that it is curious to see how little the actors in history know of the facts which are most important. It is as curious to see how often the contemporary on-lookers have detected the secrets which the actors suppose they have kept safe. Mr. Bancroft has been admitted to the confidential correspondence of the French court, for all those years which were unloosing American loyalty. In his last volumes he showed us the amazing prophecies of Vergennes and Choiseul; in this volume are bits of their keen observation of that which was going on in England, which they understood so much more clearly than did Englishmen themselves. "It is plain enough," said Vergennes, in December, 1774, "that the king is puzzled between his desire of reducing the Colonies and his dread of driving them to a separation." To Louis the Sixteenth, then only seven months on his throne, whom the statesman was teaching the science of government from magnificent living specimens, he explained, —

"that the proceedings of the Continental Congress contained the germ of a rebellion; that while the Americans really desired a reconciliation with the mother country, the ministry, from their indifference, would prevent its taking place; that Lord North, no longer confident of having America at his feet, was disconcerted by the unanimity and vigor of the Colonies; and that France had nothing to fear but the return of Chatham to power." — Chap. XVII. p. 190.

April of 1775 came. "Vergennes saw things just as they were," which was more than anybody in power in England did. The battle of Lexington fixed the attention of the French government. The French embassy at London reported, with great accuracy, that the Americans would not be tired of the revolt; that they could provide for their own wants at home. They appreciated Franklin's ability even then. "All England," wrote the French embassy, "is in a position from which she can never extricate herself." This prophetic language shows us in that day the fine practical penetration which seems the constitutional trait of French statesmen; and as exactly does the blind, bulldog tenacity with which the English Parliament held on to the policy dic-

tated by the king mark English statesmanship, not only of that day, but of days since them. Nor was Vergennes satisfied with prophesying English discomfiture. In a paper of which we should be glad to see more, he says:—

“The spirit of revolt, wherever it breaks out, is always a troublesome example. Moral maladies, as well as those of the physical system, can become contagious. We must be on our guard, that the independence which produces so terrible an explosion in North America may not communicate itself to points that interest us in the hemispheres.* We long ago made up our own mind to the results which are now observed; we saw with regret that the crisis was drawing near; we have a presentiment that it may be followed by more extensive consequences. We do not disguise from ourselves the aberrations which enthusiasm can encourage, and which fanaticism can effectuate.” — Chap. XXXIII. p. 351.

There is solemn prophecy, considering what enthusiasm and fanaticism came after it.

The greatest danger for the writer of American history is that he will write as if this nation were at any time a unit, and let his readers forget that at every moment it has been a composite, and often a scarcely organized federation. Men are tempted to write of the “Unum,” and to forget the “E Pluribus.” The annalists of the present moment fall into this error. Our newspapers give us the farrago of what passes at Washington, which is really only the resultant of what is passing in the various partisan centres of thirty or forty different sovereignties, — whose various lights and darknesses are simply reflected to us from the warped and stained metropolitan mirror. The same thing is very apt to happen in our Revolutionary history. Because the history of France for a year may be told in a chapter which tells of that year’s battle, — of Marengo, Jena, or Austerlitz, — our historians pick out our little battles, and give us Lexington and Bunker Hill, as if they were the whole history of 1775; and Brooklyn, White Plains, and Trenton, as if they were the history of 1776. But this is a very superficial assumption. These battles were, so to speak, lost or won before they were

* Is this accurately translated ?

fought. Why was there no powder at Bunker Hill? Why no generalship at Brooklyn? Why the necessity of the bold stroke at Trenton? Whoever plods through those narratives as almost every writer wants to guide him, — as if one nation, organized, accustomed to command and well commanded, were measuring strength against such another nation, — is constantly tumbling into pitfalls, from which his guides do not help him. His Washington of Brooklyn Heights has an army of some twenty thousand men. His Washington of Trenton, five months after, has a handful, of a few skeleton regiments. The change is to be found, not in the chances of war, but in the separate histories of thirteen sovereignties just adjusting the details of their affairs.

Mr. Bancroft has a passion, on the other hand, for bringing in, even from the most unexpected quarters, the different threads of influence which were woven into the history. It is not in his nature to be satisfied with the old homespun fabric, which had a warp of ministry and a woof of Washington, and out of the black and white make out such a little rectangular pattern as it could. He is at work rather on a great Gobelin picture. Where you think of it least, he brings in some backwoodsman's council, or the resolves of some Presbyterian prayer-meeting, or a little stroke of Canadian policy, in colors which you have not had in the picture before, which may not betray themselves on the surface again, but which give, just at that point, the life and flash which the picture demands. From the perfect chaos of material which he must have at command, he seems to have selected these various illustrations of the springs of public opinion very happily. It is, of course, impossible to introduce them all. The question with the historian is the same as the question of the landscape painter, always recurring, and just now, thanks to Mr. Ruskin, familiar to every one. Of the millions on millions of tints which every landscape paints on the retina, which palette-full will you select as those which shall best suggest that landscape to another? Of the millions on millions of fountains which ran together into brooks, united in larger torrents, and became the Mississippi of American Independence, which will you select, when you have seen them

all, as those which will best suggest your impression of the whole to your reader? It is in their decision of this question that historians differ from each other. Gibbon selects those details which are spicy and wicked; Hume, those which are on the surface, not often contradicted, and may be spoken of roundly and with ease; Lingard, always those which are dry, dull, and authenticated by official documents; Macaulay, those which are sparkling, amusing, and marked by personal impress of individual character. It is not so easy to say what is Mr. Bancroft's principle of selection. Only, as we have intimated, he meant to select enough. He had rather devote five pages to five incidents than to one. He had the birth of an empire to describe, and he did not mean to describe it as if it were the birth of a German principality; or, as Mr. Webster expresses it, of "a spot on the earth's surface."* Just as Washington brought together in Mount Vernon the evergreens of New England, the magnolias of Georgia, the buckeyes of Ohio, and the coffee-trees of Kentucky, Mr. Bancroft does not feel satisfied unless he can interlard the narrative which he is digesting from the state papers with scraps of pioneer life, of plantation life, and of camp-meeting life. The consequence, undoubtedly, is a want of uniformity. But this is not to be shunned by the historian of that nation to which God gave the mission of making unity out of diversity. It is not to be ascribed as the fault of the writer, that America was to be born out of the union of English, Scotch, Irish, French, German, and Spaniard,—even of the English Cavalier with the English Puritan,—even of the Irish Presbyterian with the Irish Catholic;—that, at the birth, you find even the French Huguenot joining with all the others to proclaim the religious emancipation of the French Catholic of Canada. That was the destiny of this country,—a destiny wrought in with all her early dangers, and with all her later triumphs. It is a destiny which she will have completely fulfilled, when she shall have solved the wider questions of race, as well as the narrower, and show, for the first time since the ark rested upon Ararat, how the European, the African, and the Asiatic threads are to be twisted three in one.

* Mr. Webster to the Chevalier Hülsemann.

Mr. Bancroft understands the magnitude of this problem, and it is charming to see how he plays with it and around it all along. He is never quite so happy as when he brings a French courtier and the moderator of a New England town-meeting into one paragraph; or as when, with dignity which rises to solemnity, he points the musket of a negro over the breastwork at Breed's Hill.

"Nor should history forget to record that, as in the army at Cambridge, so also in this gallant band, the free negroes of the Colony had their representatives. For the right of free negroes to bear arms in the public defence was, at that day, as little disputed in New England as their other rights. They took their place, not in a separate corps, but in the ranks with the white man, and their names may be read on the pension rolls of the country, side by side with those of other soldiers of the Revolution." — Chap. XXXIX. p. 421.

We acknowledge that, as we read, we have sometimes a fear that Mr. Bancroft has been tempted to estimate the importance of an authority by its rarity. In the rivalry which now prevails among different collectors and authors to seize for themselves the rare manuscripts and papers which are the material for history, that is a very natural temptation to which the author yields who quotes his unique tract as if it were really of more worth than the other tract published the same day which has been reprinted a dozen times. Of course, again, the unique tracts and the manuscripts just now recovered from oblivion give to history just that smack of novelty and freshness which every reader claims, however unreasonably, and which every author is so naturally desirous to give. As we have already intimated, however, such escapes from the ruts of the first explorers, if they are mistakes, are mistakes on the right side.

Mr. Bancroft gives to his thirty-seventh chapter the title "Massachusetts asks for George Washington as Commander-in-Chief." This does not simply allude to the motion, celebrated in all our histories, made by John Adams, and described by him in his Diary in the following words.

"Accordingly, when Congress had assembled, I rose in my place, and spoke. . . . I concluded with a motion in form, that Congress would adopt the army at Cambridge and appoint a general; that,

though this was not the proper time to nominate a general, yet, as I had reason to believe this was a point of the greatest difficulty, I had no hesitation to declare that I had but one gentleman in my mind for that important command, and that was a gentleman from Virginia who was among us and very well known to all of us, — a gentleman whose skill and experience as an officer, whose independent fortune, great talents, and excellent universal character, would command the approbation of all America, and unite the cordial exertions of all the Colonies better than any other person in the Union." — *Life and Works of John Adams*, Vol. II. p. 416.

It appears from Mr. Bancroft that the motion, when it was made, did not take Massachusetts by surprise. It had been first suggested here. President Adams distinctly says of it, that he consulted Samuel Adams, and that he said nothing. In another place he says that Samuel Adams was irresolute in regard to it. The impression generally conveyed by the passage has probably been, that John Adams, who "claims the credit," as Mr. Irving says, "of bringing the members to a decision," was also the original mover of the suggestion. But he does not himself make that claim. And Mr. Bancroft now states distinctly, what has not, we think, been publicly made known before, that the leading men in Massachusetts herself sent on from the camp the suggestion of the necessity of Washington's appointment to the Adamses and the other delegates at Philadelphia.

"To this end, the Congress of Massachusetts formally invited the General Congress 'to assume the regulation and direction of the army, then collecting from different Colonies for the defence of the rights of America.' At the same time Samuel Adams received a private letter from Joseph Warren, interpreting the words as a request that the continent should 'take the command of the army by appointing a generalissimo.' The generalissimo whom Joseph Warren, Warren of Plymouth, Gerry, and others desired, was Washington." — Chap. XXXVII. p. 369.

We may notice, in passing, that, in the midst of all the moderation and efforts at conciliation with which that Congress began, Washington, without speaking, had silently but impressively marked his sense of the crisis all along, by appearing at the daily sessions in military uniform. He was

the chairman of its military committee. It ought to be matter of no little pride to Massachusetts men, that from this State, where on the day of the battle of Lexington his name was scarcely known, the impulse was sent to Philadelphia which resulted in his appointment as generalissimo, on the day of the battle of Bunker Hill.

We suppose that the curious information here given regarding this wish of the leaders of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress, is derived from the papers of Samuel Adams; and that, so far as this account differs from his kinsman's, the difference is to be ascribed to their varying recollections. When Mr. Bancroft publishes the collection of Revolutionary letters which he promises us, a discrepancy so curious will be fully illustrated.

At this point, however, we must express, once for all, our regret at Mr. Bancroft's determination to omit all reference to authorities as he goes on with his narrative. If in the first volumes of his book he gave too many references, as he supposes, and as we do not suppose, that is no reason why he should now counterbalance that defect by giving us none. Granting what he says in his Preface, that all the papers used could not be cited without burdening the pages with a disproportionate commentary, — granting again what Mr. Hildreth urges, in justifying his like omissions, that the notes may be arranged so as to make a parade, — it does not follow that, where an old problem is for the first time solved, the process of solution, or the postulates for it, should nowhere be alluded to. Every authority need not be cited. But where points of importance wholly new are raised, the reader has some rights, as well as the author. We are willing that a physician who is dealing with the commonplaces of his art shall go on without constantly alluding to the elementary authorities. But if his treatment becomes wholly new, we expect him to tell us how he arrives at it. We are willing that a clergyman shall preach without a perpetual reference to texts. But the moment he offers us a doctrine which he acknowledges is a new doctrine, we compel him to say where he got it. In the present state of astronomy, a man may say that the world moves round the sun, without referring to

Copernicus; but if Mr. Peirce chooses to say, what is equally true, that

$$\Sigma_i A_i^{[i]} = B (1 - c^{-kt}),$$

or, in other words, that the rotation area is proportional to $1 - c^{-kt}$, we expect him to prove it, though he should "encumber" a dozen pages in the process. We conceive this to be, in general, the rule for the introduction of authorities. The court—that is to say, the gentle readers—are "expected to know something." But the moment the author before them has arrived at a conclusion on which, in his own heart, he prides himself as an important novelty, he must give the court some clew as to the method by which he attained it.

Indeed, we may add, that the author himself is in need of the recurrence, even to the last instant of publication, to the sources of his information. If he is engaged, at the last, in adjusting his detailed references to them, he saves himself from mistake, while he relieves his readers' curiosity. We may take, as an instance, the following unintelligible passage, where Mr. Bancroft has fallen into error. He is preparing for his account of the Americans' seizure of Bunker Hill.

"But delay would have rendered even the attempt impossible. Gage, with the three major-generals, was forming a plan for extending his lines over Charlestown. To this end, Howe was to land troops on the Point, Clinton in the centre; while Burgoyne was to cannonade from the Causeway. The operations, it was conceived, would be very easy; and their execution was fixed for the 18th of June. This design became known in the American camp." — p. 407.

This statement is wholly new in our history, and is erroneous from end to end. It springs from a mistake in reading a letter of Burgoyne to Lord Stanley, in which he states that Gage and the generals had formed a plan for extending their lines, not "over Charlestown," but over *Dorchester Neck*. "Howe was to land on the Point (Dorchester Point), Clinton in the centre, and I to cannonade from the Causeway, or Neck," — that is, Boston Neck. The whole passage is perfectly clear; and Mr. Bancroft knows the ground so well, that he would himself have seen the error he made in mistaking *Dorchester* for *Charlestown* on his first reading, had he had on him that necessity for detailed super-

vision which the insertion of authorities for new points requires. We need not hesitate to allude to this little oversight, as it gives us the opportunity of saying, that, minute though it is, it is the most important of the few errors in detail which have arrested our attention.

We have no other fault to find with this brilliant and fascinating volume, unless that which is so easily pardoned,—that its tone is, perhaps, too uniformly the tone of panegyric of the Whigs and philippic on the Tories. Mr. Bancroft does full justice, it is true, to the moderates of the outbreak. None of our historians have shown us before what the real politics of the colonial side were. They were not a resistless tide. They had their compromises, and doubts, and mutual concessions, as all politics have. But we have some pity for the Tories, or Loyalists,—more than our author has. He falls quite into the humor of the popular press of the time as he deals with them. To our view, the grandeur of the popular victory is enhanced, and the real truth of history subserved, by the acknowledgment that these men had their weight of influence, and used it. We are sorry that we must add the confession, which we are afraid this volume does not make very distinctly, that they were sometimes shamefully handled by the successful side.

If, however, the author's enthusiasm in the good cause sometimes misleads him, he gives, all the way through, good reason for his enthusiasm. He shows, from the beginning of his book to the end, that the people were building better than they knew, that the cause which united so many diverse elements of strength was a divine cause, which had the providence of God himself for its ally, because it was a part of the advancing movement of the world. Mr. Bancroft does not write as if this were every-day narrative, because he knows it is a narrative of such events as very seldom cross the ages. We cannot but rejoice that the history is told by one who sees with his keen eye the infinite relations by which it is bound to all other history, and who works upon its details with the eagerness and perseverance which should be concentrated on so grand a theme. Of this insight, eagerness, and energy the result is a narrative of fascinating in-

terest. It is as exciting as were the times themselves. Once engaged with the picture, it is very hard to turn from it to meaner themes. It has the blush of novelty, even to readers who think themselves at home in that early struggle. And it so shows us how the corner-stones of our history were fixed, that the student of to-day feels that he understands their relations even better than his fathers did, by whose hands those stones were laid.

ART. VIII.—REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

WE are very glad to see De Wette's Introduction to the New Testament* in our language. It is needless to say to readers of German, that it has long been considered the best work of the kind in a country where special attention has been given to this department of Biblical literature. We hope it will engage the attention of our American theologians, as well for whatever error as for whatever truth it contains on the important subjects of which it treats. The great merit of the work is, that by its very ample references, not only to original sources of information, but to the most distinguished writers on both sides of every questionable opinion or statement, the author enables the student to examine for himself, and form his own judgment. We hope it may be the means of exciting American scholars to attempt something in a branch of theological science, in which thus far they have done absolutely nothing.

In Germany, since the time of Semler, who may be regarded as the founder of this department of theological inquiry, it has employed the labor of a large number of eminent men, among whom are to be found the names of Michaelis, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Jahn, Hug, Schott, Credner, Reuss. The work of the last, though more recent than that of De Wette, is in our view in several respects decidedly inferior to it.

In England, as well as this country, the clergy have relied chiefly on the heterogeneous compilation of Hartwell Horne, which, though it contains a good deal of valuable information, contains also a mass of worthless rubbish. Recently Dr. Davidson has published valuable introductions to the Old and New Testament, which we should recommend to all clergymen to own, as well as that of De Wette. But certainly Dr. Davidson is to be regarded as an industrious selector of

* An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. By WILLIAM MARTIN LEBERECHE DE WETTE. Translated from the Fifth, improved and enlarged Edition, by FREDERICK FROTHINGHAM. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1858.

views which, on the whole, strike him as worthy of reception, from the great mass of German writers, rather than as an independent historical critic, forming his own judgment from an examination of original sources.

For the present work, at least in this latest edition, the author's previous labors had been a very important preparation. More than fifty years ago, when quite young, he published a work on the Pentateuch and the Books of Chronicles,* evincing great originality and penetration, which deservedly attracted great attention throughout Germany. Since that time he has made a translation of the whole of the Old and New Testament, together with the Apocrypha, which, in our opinion, (which was also the opinion of the late Professor Stuart,) is the very best that exists in any language. He has also written a Commentary on the Psalms, of great excellence, of which five editions have been printed. His Introduction to the Old Testament has been translated in this country. The seventh edition of the original was published a short time before the author's death. Above all, he has written a Commentary on the whole of the New Testament, which, for compactness, learning, and critical ability, most scholars regard as the best that has been made. It is evident that a work on the New Testament, which has engaged the labors of such a man for more than twenty years, is *prima facie* entitled to great respect; especially when we know that ample testimony has been borne by his countrymen to his character for purity, truth, and fervent religious spirit.

We have said thus much to bespeak the favor of the reader for this work, because expressions and opinions occur in it which will grate harshly on the prevalent feeling of reverence for the Bible, which properly belongs to the great objects revealed in it. For though we have reason to believe that the Christian sentiment of religious devotion was characteristic of the author, yet he felt himself under obligation, in entering upon a critical history of the New Testament, to proceed in a rigidly scientific method, to guard against everything of an apologetic nature, and to examine the history of the books of the New Testament, their character, design, and claims to genuineness, in a purely literary spirit, and with as little deference to his own Christian feelings, or those of the Church, as if the subjects of his inquiries were the poems of Homer or Virgil. His intense and constant effort for conciseness of language, and for compressing his matter into the smallest possible compass, makes some of his critical remarks seem the more harsh and ungracious, to one unaccustomed to the freedom of German Biblical criticism and exposition.

It must also be allowed, we think, that not only has the author proceeded from what may be called a sceptical stand-point, but, with respect to matters of history, the tendency of his mind was rather a sceptical one; that is, a tendency to discern with great sharp-sightedness what is false, feigned, or unsupported, rather than to yield to authority of any kind in building up and establishing what is generally received.

* His *Beiträge*, etc. Halle, 1806.

This should be kept in mind by the student of the work in cases where the author may seem to be hypercritical, or to express himself with caution and doubt where his own arguments would seem to authorize confidence. Still his own remark is a just one, that "nothing is gained by magisterial decisions and bold assertions."

The work is divided into two parts; the first containing in eighty-two pages information which relates to the books of the New Testament as a whole, treating of the original language in which they were written, the ancient versions of them, the principles of textual criticism, the history of the text, and the most important manuscripts and other authority on which it rests, and by which it is to be corrected. We think that all impartial scholars will agree with us in regard to this part of the work, that nowhere else can be found so large an amount of information relating to the subjects of which it treats, expressed in language of great precision, condensed into so small a compass.

The second part of the work relates to the origin, authorship, contents, and design of the particular books of the New Testament. It is the result of an immense amount of critical investigation, with copious references, in a smaller type than that of the text, not only to original authorities, but to the eminent writers of various opinions who have treated of the subject discussed. Thus, when he does not satisfy the student that his own opinion, modestly, we might almost say sceptically expressed, is correct, he furnishes him ample means for correcting it.

On the difficult problem of the origin and coincidences of the first three Gospels he has spent a vast amount of labor, and his criticisms evince a great deal of discrimination. As none of the multitudinous theories on this subject has yet given complete satisfaction to any careful inquirer, it would not be strange if that of De Wette should fail to satisfy. It may claim the merit of resting on a very minute comparison of the Gospels. It is certainly more satisfactory than the mere oral-tradition theory of Gieseler, which is the same with that which has been so ably illustrated in Mr. Norton's work on the Genuineness of the Gospels.

The introduction to the Gospel of John will be specially interesting at this time, on account of the author's criticisms on the arguments which have been urged by Baur against the genuineness and authenticity of this Gospel, with an imposing confidence which is in very striking contrast with the modesty and caution of De Wette. To a careful student of this introduction to John, De Wette supplies arguments which in our opinion go far to refute all that Baur has written on the subject. We regret that it was not consistent with the plan of his work to enter into a full discussion of the question, and illustrate his hints more at large. Having recently had occasion to make a careful examination of what Baur has written against the genuineness and authenticity of this Gospel, we have been astonished at the scanty foundation of fact on which, with logic worthy of a better cause, he has endeavored to establish the hypothesis that the author of the fourth Gospel was a forger of the second century, a manufacturer of the discourses and inventor of the miracles therein recorded. We should express the

result of our inquiries in regard to the fourth Gospel in accordance with those of De Wette, rather than with those of Baur, if the alternative lay between the two.

It is impossible within reasonable limits to state the many cases in which our judgment differs from that of De Wette. We will only advert to his decision, on subjective grounds, against the genuineness of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, and his opinion that it was an imitation of the Epistle to the Colossians by a later writer. But here, as in other cases, he has furnished the educated reader with the means of correcting the error, if it be one. He has given parallel columns of coincidences of thought and expression between the Colossians and Ephesians. We think it in accordance with familiar experience, that these coincidences should arise from the circumstance that both Epistles were written for different communities at about the same time, especially as we see in the Epistle to the Ephesians no motive for a forged imitation of that to the Colossians. It is also to be recollected, that there is no reason to suppose that Paul expected his letters to be brought together in one volume.

If the author of the work before us had studied conciseness and compression less, it would have been more interesting to the general reader. But there is at least a saving of expense to theological students, whose means are not usually very ample. The volume contains nearly as much information as the five volumes of Eichhorn, or the three of Davidson.

The translation by Mr. Frothingham, who by a residence of a few years in Germany found out how much the work was there valued, deserves great commendation. It is close, accurate, and clear. We have examined it very thoroughly, without being able to find a single mistake. If any one doubt the merit of a good translation from the German, especially of a work so difficult on account of the studied conciseness of expression, let him compare this of Mr. Frothingham with several which within a few years have been received from the other side of the water. We cannot close without expressing our thanks for the clear, accurate, and handsome manner in which the work has been printed.

A word from the "Translator's Preface" will indicate the precise position of this volume in the progress of critical inquiry:—

"The translator at one time entertained the idea of adding to the notes, and filling out the list of works referred to, so as to show the changes and results of critical thought and inquiry during the past ten years, and thus, so far as possible, to bring the work into line with the most recent criticism. The prospect of being able to do this within any reasonable time was, however, rendered too uncertain, by the pressure of other engagements, to warrant the attempt. The work is therefore presented in the form which De Wette gave it,—a monument in the history of New Testament criticism."

CONFESSIONALISM, and the reactionary spirit now prevalent in German theology, are not so advanced in their occupation of the national mind as entirely to extinguish the ancient and hereditary freedom in that native land of the Reformation. An independent activity con-

tinues to manifest itself within the domain of theology, as well in efforts of destructive criticism, as in works of a liberal and progressive, but also earnest and constructive faith.

We have before us two recent publications, which severally and characteristically illustrate both these tendencies. The first is a critical attack on the popular faith, by J. W. Rumpf of Basle.* The author addresses himself to the unlearned ("Nichttheologen"), and aims to present in a popular form the negative results of the recent antagonistic criticism applied to the Church and the Bible, — to do for the German public what Hennell, Foxton, Greg, and others, have done for the English. He brings a good deal of ability, industry, thoroughness, and — we would fain believe — an honest purpose, to a questionable and ungracious task.

Herr Rumpf apparently writes from a lower plane of intellectual and moral life than Mr. Greg, and though the decencies, moral and literary, are for the most part duly respected, there fails not here and there a fling and a sneer, betraying a wounded spirit whose quarrel with the Church may not be altogether a theological one.

The work is one of very unequal merit. We have been particularly interested in that portion which speaks of the doubts that are likely to be engendered, and that have been engendered in the minds of many wise and good, by the popular creed. The argument drawn from the discrepancies between the traditional doctrine of the Church and the doctrine of the New Testament is sound and well put. On the other hand, the portion to which the author in his Preface invites particular attention, as containing matter peculiar to himself, — the chapters on the miracles of Christ,† — strikes us as one of the weakest in the book. What are we to think of the dialectic of a man who regards this sophism of Cicero as decisive on the question of the New Testament miracles? Cicero (*De Divinatione*, Lib. II. 28) says that nothing happens but what was possible, and if that only happens which could happen, it is not to be regarded as a miracle. This, Herr Rumpf thinks, settles the question.

The other publication to which we have referred — very unlike, in purpose and spirit, the one just discussed — is Bunsen's "*Bibelwerk*,"‡ of which the first half-volume has just been issued by Brockhaus. This work aims also to bring the results of modern criticism, so far as they are fixed and demonstrable, before the people. But with a difference. The purpose here is not negative, but positive; it is not to destroy, but to fulfil; not to alienate or repel from the Bible and from Bible-Christendom, but to strengthen the interest in them and to win men to them. The aim is "to make the Book of books actually accessible to the German people, to the *Congregation* of his country."

* *Bibel und Christus. Beleuchtung der Gründe für den Kirchenglauben.* Von JOHANN WILHELM RUMPF. Strassburg. 1858.

† See Vorrede, p. iv.; also Haupttheil IV. C. 2-6.

‡ Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*. Vollständiges Bibelwerk, für die Gemeinde. In drei Abtheilungen. Von CHRISTIAN CARL JOSIAS BUNSEN. Erste Abtheilungen. Die Bibel. Uebersetzung und Ezklärung. Erster Theil. Das Gesetz. Erster Habband. Einleitung und Genesis 1-11. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. 1858.

It is no hasty undertaking of which Chevalier Bunsen here gives us the first-fruits. It is a life-long work, now approaching its completion. For forty years it has constituted the central object of the author's studies and labors. Whatever learning, wisdom, experience, Christian zeal, and Christian candor may contribute, to illustrate, interpret, and recommend the Bible, is here concentrated on that task. The name of Bunsen is a guaranty for these, and a pledge of the success of the most important contribution to Biblical literature and Christian instruction attempted in this age.

The work is to consist of three divisions, in eight volumes. The first division will contain the translation and interpretation of the Old and New Testament, in four parts. The translation will adopt the Lutheran idiom, long consecrated by congregational use. The second division will be a critical investigation of the origin and history of the text. The third will be an historical exhibition of the great events and personalities of the Bible, in two sections,—"The Bible in the World's History," and "The World's History in the Bible." The present publication gives the first half of the first volume. It contains the "Preliminary Address to the Congregation" (*Vorwort an die Gemeinde*); a general Introduction (*Vorerinnerungen*), discussing the necessity, propriety, and method of the work; an historical and critical view of the canon, of previous translations and expositions; thirty proof specimens of translations; chronological tables of Biblical history, synchronically adjusted to universal history, and embodying the results of recent investigations, to which Bunsen himself, in his work on Egypt, has largely contributed; and, finally, the beginning of the Translation, to the twelfth chapter of Genesis.

The author addresses himself to the "Congregation," that is, to the *Ecclesia*, the Church in the eldest and largest sense of the word,—to the Christendom of Germany. "Whoso says Bible, says Congregation. For the congregation of Christ's disciples, the world over, possesses the spirit of God which Christ promised. It is and will remain to the end of all things the supreme bearer and interpreter of this Word of God, by according or dissenting conscience."

This opening address exhibits in an eminent degree that mixture of sobriety and freedom, of science and devotion, of piety and candor,—that progressive-conservative spirit which marks the enterprise and the man. "So then to the glory and honor of God and Christ, united in faith and love with all apostles and confessors, with the Bible in the hand, we oppose ourselves to all heathenism as to all Judaism, to all secularization of the Christian God-consciousness, as leading to idolatry; and equally to all stark outwardness of the letter, as erecting a new Judaism."

Of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel he speaks emphatically and with heat. Many who agree with him in his critical conclusion, will scarcely accompany him in his practical corollary. "It is frivolous blindness or bitter mockery when now, with us and elsewhere, men arise, who would persuade themselves and us, that with that supposition [the spuriousness of John's Gospel] a communal Christendom can any

longer subsist. If the Gospel of John is no historical report of an eyewitness, but a myth, then there is no historical Christ, and without an historical Christ all communal Christian faith is an illusion, all Christian confession hypocrisy or deception, the Christian worship of God a mummery, the Reformation finally a crime or a madness."

WE are compelled to postpone to another number the notice of several recent publications, including the new volume of *Selections from Martineau's writings*, Mr. Bartol's "*Church and Congregation*," and sundry pamphlets suggested (in part) by the late "*Revival*."

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

IN this new volume of the *Historical Collections*,* we have an unusual variety of subjects and of interest. More than half the volume is required for the publication of the letter-books of the Relief Committee, appointed by the Town of Boston, to take charge of the donations sent from all parts of the country for the sufferers by the Boston Port Bill. This correspondence covers a period of nearly a year, and one or two closing letters which belong to a subsequent period. The books have been already gleaned by Mr. Frothingham and Mr. Bancroft for their *Histories*. The original documents, however, are, in all such cases, more interesting than any abridgment or digest. Indeed, we can conceive of no documents which more completely show the tone of public opinion for the year before the outbreak, than these very curious papers. They show, on the one hand, how completely the quarrel of Boston was taken up as a national quarrel, and, on the other hand, the nature of the home difficulties which were met by the patriots here. They also illustrate, in a very striking way, that essential characteristic of our whole system, the individuality, or independent sovereignty, of the several towns of New England.

The contributions were most generous, some of the smallest towns in very distant places sending gifts very large in proportion to their ability. At the same time it is evident, from the tone of the letters to and from some of the distant points, that communication was not frequent, and that these were the gifts of new allies, rather than those who had long felt themselves fellow-citizens. Historical characters appear here in new relations. Old General Putnam seems himself to have driven down the flock of sheep which the town of Pomfret sent, and Augustine Washington is requested to assist Mr. Tileston in the sale of hoes and axes manufactured by the destitute workmen of Boston in the employ of the Committee. Better than this, however, is the glimpse which the letters give us of those who are not historical characters, the All-Saints of the Revolution, unknown to fame. In this revelation they show what the real power of the popular cause was. We can conceive of nothing more discouraging to a man of General Gage's temper, than the daily witnessing of such arrivals as Mr. Cleveland's beef-

* Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Volume Fourth of the Fourth Series.

car, the New-Market men's seven cattle, the Providence flock of one hundred and thirty-five sheep, and the trains of wagons from Salem and Marblehead, where the Port Bill compelled the large Southern donations of provisions to be landed. Such gifts were arriving, literally, every day. Such a method of warfare must have shown him more of the power and spirit of the Colonies, than any message which "Old Put" sent him the next year from the "Congress" iron mortar. He was more used to these missiles than to those.

Scottow's narrative of the planting of the Massachusetts Colony, a very rare old tract, originally printed in 1694, is reprinted as the second contribution to this volume. There follows a very curious and interesting paper by Governor Washburn on the extinction of Slavery in Massachusetts. This must become the standard authority on that critical and remarkable victory of human right.

There follow some unprinted letters of Thomas Cushing's, — some curious memoranda of General Gage, with regard to the opening of hostilities, — three contemporary accounts of the destruction of the tea, transcribed by Dr. Sparks from the originals in England, — a letter of Samuel Adams's, and one of Joseph Hawley's, before unpublished, and all the originals of Andrew Eliot's letters to Hollis, so often alluded to by Hollis in his Memoirs. All of these are very properly published in the same volume with the letters of the Committee on Relief, for they furnish valuable illustration of the feelings of the Colonists in the ten years preceding the war.

Any reader of sense goes back to the original authorities as often as he can. They are of course not so comprehensive as later history, but they are always more racy. This volume is exactly the companion which Mr. Bancroft would desire to have read by the side of his new volume, which we have noticed elsewhere. While he gives the complete view of the beginning of the war, these letters supply thousands of illustrations, where he is obliged to content himself with one or two.

Dr. Jenks has furnished, from a French work in the Historical Library, a notice of the *Sieur d'Aulnay*, that almost mythical personage of the early New England historians. An original narrative by Phineas Pratt, one of Weston's men, who came over in 1622, himself one of the mythical men of Massachusetts, closes the older histories in the volume. To these are added memoirs of Messrs. Davis, Lawrence, and Hunt, members of the Society recently deceased.

EVERY great step in the progress of mankind is appointed to have its hero, — a man born for the work and identified with it, — a man with whom the *cause* is a greater and more absorbing thing than any gain or fame that comes of his connection with it. George Stephenson was precisely such a hero. His *Life* * is the history of the greatest industrial enterprise of modern times. Nothing since the Protestant Reformation, thinks Mr. Smiles, is equal in grandeur and importance to the railway

* *Life of George Stephenson, Railway Engineer.* By SAMUEL SMILES. From the Fourth London Edition. Boston: Ticknor and Fields.

system, inaugurated, championed, and triumphantly established by his single brain and hand. He was just such a man as the enterprise demanded, — as if expressly born, bred, and foreappointed to it. Of the finest physical type of the Northumbrian Briton, tall, athletic, of untiring fibre and undaunted will, — bred to toil, so that at eight he earned his twopence a day as herd-boy, and his shilling at fourteen, — a born engineer, making his clay models of engines when a child, and ten years later taking his machine to pieces every week, and making over those parts that refused to work, — restless in his hungering for knowledge, learning to read first at eighteen, and choosing night-work that he may have the day for study, — struggling with poverty, spending his leisure in the repair of shoes and clocks, and only kept from emigrating by the lack of means, — so intensely practical, that, with his rude appliances and fragments of chemical lore, he fairly anticipates Sir Humphrey Davy in his great invention of the Safety-Lamp, — doing battle for the locomotive and iron road as one should do battle for a kingdom or a flag, — fighting never for himself, but always for the indomitable instinct that masters him and the cause of mechanical progress which makes his vehement faith, — as modest as he is brave, and as honorable in dealing as he is skilful in contrivance, — here is a man who stands at last, untitled, in the front rank of modern nobility, the champion of the people and the counsellor of kings. Truly it is a good thing to watch a career so bravely entered on, so calmly and magnanimously followed out.

We need not enlarge on a story which almost every one has read. It is well told, — with enough enthusiasm in the narrator, and a sufficient sense of its importance as a chapter in universal history. One or two points it is pleasant to call to mind, which show the personal quality of the man. Amidst the mockery of those who thought him mad, the bullying and abuse of Parliament-men, the civil sneers of men of science and engineers, the distrust of the company he serves, the malignant opposition of vested interests, and wild rumors, such as that “hundreds of men and horses had sunk in Chat Moss, and railways were at an end for ever,” — we find the same resolute courage, and faith in himself compelling the faith of others. Amidst the mania of speculation and extravagance of schemes started by his own amazing success, we find the same simple, high-minded honesty, the same cool and steady common sense. “Though it would put £500 in my pocket to specify my own patent rails, I cannot do so after the experience I have had; if you take my advice, you will not lay down a single cast-iron rail.” That is the temper of the man. He never bought a railway share on speculation, and never sold a share, though he might gain or save whole fortunes. His point of honor was to fulfil his contract faithfully, and to breed a school of honest engineers.* Tender and true in his

* “The identical engines constructed by Mr. Stephenson in 1816 are to this day to be seen in regular useful work upon the Killingworth railway, conveying heavy coal-trains at the speed of between five and six miles an hour, probably as economically as any of the more perfect locomotives now in use.” (p. 136.)

affections, his early love has the savor of a rustic romance; he toils and spares to give his boy the book culture he has learned to value by his own want of it; in mature years his hand is open in many an act of timely charity, and he pleads, "with the tears streaming down his cheeks," with some backslider who is ruining himself by strong drink.

A good many incidental matters make this biography very interesting, apart from its main subject:—the early story of the railway system; the invention and value of the "steam-blast"; the grand trial-day and triumph of the "Rocket"; the rise and characteristics of the class of "Navvies"; the tale of the railway mania; "fast engineers" and schemes of atmospheric traction; and the great battle in the dark with the Demon of the Mine. We copy, for its curious and pathetic interest, an anecdote which shows how the world had to wait more than two centuries for the hour and the man to meet.

"We were crossing the court [of the Bicêtre], and I, more dead than alive with fright, kept close to my companion's side, when a frightful face appeared behind some bars, and a hoarse voice exclaimed, 'I am not mad! I am not mad! I have made a discovery that would enrich the country that adopted it.' 'What has he discovered?' asked our guide. 'O,' answered the keeper, shrugging his shoulders, 'you would never guess it; it is the use of the steam of boiling water.' I began to laugh. 'This man,' continued the keeper, 'is named Solomon de Caus; he came from Normandy four years ago to present to the king a statement of the wonderful effects that might be produced from his invention. To listen to him, you would imagine that, with steam, you could navigate ships, move carriages; in fact, there is no end to the miracles which (he insists upon it) could be performed. The Cardinal (Richelieu) sent the madman away without listening to him. Solomon de Caus, far from being discouraged, followed the Cardinal wherever he went, with the most determined perseverance, who, tired of finding him for ever in his path, and annoyed at his folly, shut him up in the Bicêtre.' He has even written a book about it, which I have here." (Letter from Marion de Lorme to Cinq-Mars, Feb. 1641.)—p. 71.

GEOGRAPHY AND TRAVELS.

THE mines of Siberia and the wild Steppes of Tartary make the scene of one of our best new volumes of travel.* The Oural and the Altai, bleakest of mountain regions, have had the fascination to attract and hold for seven years an artist-traveller, who reports their mineral splendors and the rude glories of their landscape with fidelity and enthusiasm. Mr. Atkinson is an enterprising Englishman, who set out with rifle and portfolio, and the "sole object to sketch the scenery of Siberia," and returns rich with 560 colored drawings and an entertaining journal of adventures. He has all the personal qualities needful for the enterprise;—a stature of near six feet; a head, as experience proves, "well-nigh bullet-proof"; a hunter's, as well as an artist's, hand and eye; is tough in the saddle and a sure shot; and braves with equal intrepidity the wild robber-hordes of the Altai, or the wilder rapids of storm-swollen rivers. Nothing but personal hardihood and a

* *Oriental and Western Siberia.* By T. W. ATKINSON. New York: Harper and Brothers. 8vo.

natural aptness of command saves him, in a score of emergencies, from plunder or death. Armed with the best of weapons and artist's tools, and with a pass from the Emperor that unlocks every ward of that intricate frontier system of locks and guards, he sets out from Moscow in March, 1847, in "a sort of half-grown omnibus" on runners; is shockingly rocked in the cradle-holes of the imperial highway, getting dangerous now towards spring; and spends a good many months in a pretty thorough exploration of the precious mines and quarries of the Oural. A journey of some four months, among the mountain ranges and steppes of Tartary, gives a picture, which to most readers must be quite new, both of the scenery and mineral wealth of that extraordinary region, and of the wild tribes, Kalmuck, Kirghi, and Cossack, among whom our author dwells. These scenes fill the largest part of the volume, some 350 pages. Returning upon the great government road, he journeys eastward as far as Irkutsk on Lake Baikal, where we take leave of him. Apparently, he spends some four or five years in forming a more intimate acquaintance with Siberia, particularly its various mining districts, and returns to Britain about 1854.

Where the adventure is genuine and fresh, we need not be captious as to style. We do not blame a man for not holding the pen of Kinglake or Dr. Kane. Yet this volume is needlessly cumbersome with many diaristic details, with episodes rather awkwardly narrated, with many labored descriptions of sky and cloud, with a traveller's scorn (quite needlessly obtruded) of the tamer landscape of the Alps and Rhine, and with occasionally such platitudes as the following (p. 312): "Had Ruskin been here, he must have acknowledged that Dame Nature was as a colorist more Turner-esque than Turner himself." But these are small defects, amply compensated by the wholesome mountain air of the book, and by the groups and natural scenes given in the generous supply of woodcuts. The land and the people, — these are the essential thing in all traveller's stories; and these are exhibited in the most full, faithful, and interesting way.

The world first began to understand the wealth of barbaric gems and gold belonging to these drear appendages of the Russian crown, at the Exhibition of 1851. But the native splendors of these regions, and the prodigious scale on which materials most gorgeous and costly are lavished, require the full setting forth, and the somewhat imaginative handling, of such a report as this. Whole districts seem to be made up of the rarest and most splendid varieties of porphyry, jasper, marble, or agate; coal and iron are found, of the finest quality, in vaster deposits than in all England (p. 302); while the gold-mines were the wonder of the world for wealth until the discoveries of the last ten years. "The jaspers are found in a great variety of colors, — the most beautiful a deep green, dark purple, dark violet, gray, and cream-color; also a ribbon-jasper, with stripes of reddish-brown and green. The porphyries are equally fine and varied, some of most brilliant colors. Oölite is also a splendid stone of a deep pink color, with veins of yellow and black; when made into vases, it is semi-transparent. Malachite is also used in making tables and various other articles. I have frequently found and painted huge masses of these splendid rocks, of

which I have now seventy-two varieties." (p. 95.) Amethyst, topaz, tourmaline, beryl, aquamarine, are the material familiar to the handling of the peasant-craftsman at fourpence a day. "Columns of jasper fourteen feet in length," vases and bas-reliefs graceful in design and perfect in workmanship as any antique, gems, seals, tables, paper-weights, inlaid perhaps with clusters of grapes in amethyst, and foliage, or figures of birds and flowers, are wrought in prodigious quantities among these remote mountain ranges, and find their way — by what means of transport is not made clear — to the imperial treasuries in St. Petersburg; for all this vast mineral wealth is the private property of the Emperor. To illustrate the system, a story is told of some uncommonly splendid jewels of emerald, which found their way to some German princess, who appeared, radiant in their stolen splendor, at the Russian court. The rare beauty of the gems led to inquiry, and suspicion fell on the director of the "Fabric," who, "without any investigation, was sent to prison, and after many years' confinement died there; nor is it known to this day by whom these emeralds were stolen. In Siberia it is still believed that the man was innocent, but that, for the safety of persons of more consideration, it was absolutely necessary he should be imprisoned; in short, it has been hinted that the offence was committed by parties much nearer his imperial Majesty." (p. 100.) We have also (pp. 118–123) a very dramatic account of the murder of an English agent at the gold-mines, and the bold stratagem by which the criminals were detected, and the system of gold-robbing checked.

Of the Russian mining-engineers it is said that "no class of men in the empire can approach them in scientific knowledge and intelligence." (p. 278.) Among the most interesting results of their skill, we are told (pp. 110–112) of the experiments by which General Anossoff succeeded in restoring the long-lost art of making true Damascus steel, "perhaps unequalled even in ancient, certainly never approached in modern times," an art which, in its perfection, seems unhappily to have since perished with its restorer. "The general fault of European blades is, that, being forged of shear-steel for the sake of elasticity, they are scarcely perceptible of the keen edge that cast-steel will assume. The genius of Anossoff has triumphed over this objection, not in hardening soft steel, but in giving elasticity to the hard." Certain condemned blades "were bent double, and back again, several times, ere they could be divided." The Russian peasants are a race at least equally remarkable. "Men are brought from a village, never having seen any mechanical operations before, and are taken into the Zavod. One is told he must be a blacksmith: he goes to his anvil without the least hesitation, and begins his work; another is ordered to be a fitter in a machine-shop: he seats himself at his bench, looks at the work his neighbor is doing, takes up his file, commences his new and to him wonderful occupation; so they go on through many branches." (p. 99.) "Here wages are almost nothing. I have seen a man engaged carving foliage on some of the jasper vases, in a style not excelled anywhere in Europe," whose wages were less than a dollar a month, besides "36 pounds of rye-flour to make into bread; meat he is supposed never to eat." Another, at the same rate of pay, was "cutting a head of Ajax,

after the antique, in jasper of two colors, — the ground a dark green, and the head a yellowish cream-color, — a splendid production of art, which would have raised the man to a high position in any country in Europe except Russia." (p. 95.)

Aside from the splendors of mountain-scenery which we have hinted at, we have in Northern Asia a weary and monotonous expanse of pine-covered sand-plains and birch-covered swamp (p. 499), with perils of bears and wolves, and dire torment of mosquitos. The prowess of the peasantry, men and women, in conflict with mighty bears, is told in many a tale of thrilling venture. Farther south, the mountain region opens now and then in "park-like scenes" of great natural beauty (p. 169), and we have glimpses of pines and larches, "some one hundred and fifty feet in height: what splendid masts they would have made!" (p. 357.) Among the pictures of savage nature there, we have an eagle (bearcoote) of prodigious strength, able to kill a deer with a stroke or two of his beak, hooded and trained to serve in hunting (p. 416); and tarantulas, living in little dens under ground, ugly and venomous, yet "the sheep eat them with impunity and relish" (p. 423); boars, wolves, and snakes, with which our author has formidable encounters; and robber-bands, no less savage and stealthy than they. The habits of the Tartar tribes, in their native haunts, — "the steppe over which Genghis Khan had marched his savage hordes more than six hundred years ago," — we have never seen portrayed with so much vivacity and minuteness. Considerably tamed they are from the wild Scythian manners which Herodotus relates, yet still in some particulars recall them.

As incidental features of the book, we refer to the account given of the Siberian convict-gangs and stations, with their barracks and stockades (p. 147); the gambling passion, so strong where no books and newspapers, or public interests, relieve the weariness of "unused powers" (p. 98); the gorgeous August display of meteors (p. 438); the figures cut on rocks (p. 193) and tumuli (p. 201), memorials of some perished and unknown races, and recalling the favorite old fancy of an ante-historic civilization in the uplands of Central Asia; the wild traditions respecting the red and white belts of quartz-rock (p. 215); the Cossack dance and song (p. 270); the night of thunder-storms (p. 327); the marvellous fish-spearing of the Kalmucks (p. 304); the hunting adventures here and there; and the robber-bands of the Altai (p. 431). These, with the specimens we have quoted before, will give a fair notion of the interest of this volume, which we have looked at wishfully in its English dress, and are glad to find in so accessible a shape.

MISCELLANEOUS.

OF the plan and execution of Appleton's "New American Cyclopædia,"* we have already spoken in general terms, which we find no

* The New American Cyclopædia: a Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. Vol. II. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

occasion to alter on the appearance of the second volume. One leading characteristic of the work has to be borne in mind in judging it, — that its main merit and aim are *literary*, as distinct from the scientific fullness, or what we may call the *working* qualities, of some similar works. It does not supersede, any more than it is superseded by, such special dictionaries as Brande's, Loudon's, or Guillet's. What can be given by essays, written descriptions, or paragraphs of information, seems to be as fully, admirably, and exactly given as we could wish. But, using tabular statements very sparingly, and pictorial illustrations not at all, such topics as architecture, mechanics, natural history, and many of the exacter sciences, can be but very imperfectly presented. This, the only radical defect of the present plan, we cannot help hoping will be in some way remedied in time. The neat and compact illustrations in the forthcoming quarto edition of Worcester's Dictionary show that we express no unreasonable regret on this point.

Bating these qualifications, we are struck again with the great freshness, amplitude, and general accuracy* of treatment apparent throughout the work. To a degree which at first sight seems hardly possible, its material is strictly new. As an example, of thirteen columns on the history of the *Austrian Empire*, eight are occupied with the events of the last twelve years, bringing its diplomacy down to January, 1858. We also find references (as under the head *Basques*) to works published within the last twelvemonth. Events hardly yet crystallized into history from their state of solution and dispersion in newspapers, despatches, and debates, are most serviceably condensed into a permanent and readable shape. Let the promise of these two volumes be fulfilled, and this one feature alone will make the work invaluable and unique.

For the clear, fresh, brilliant style of many of these papers, we wish again to express our sense of obligation, — an excellence so universal that we find it difficult to particularize. The longest paper is that on *Athens*, — forty-eight columns, — dealing perhaps a little disproportionately in details, which, however, one is glad not to spare. In this, as in the other more extended articles, the chief fault is the difficulty of finding at once the special point, of history, topography, or statistics, which one may be in search of. Among the most thorough in their information, and of chief general interest in this volume, are the papers on *Arctic Discovery*, *Asia*, *Atlantic Ocean*, *Australia*, *Bank*; very interesting in a biographical view are *Eugene Aram*, *Arnold*, *Athanasius*, *Attila*, *Augustine*, *Bacon*, *Bancroft*, *Bach*, *Barneveldt*; *Argot*, *Autobiography*, *Autograph*, *Bacchanalian*, are among the pleasant curiosities of literature; *Arboriculture*, and an excellent dissertation on *Barns*, show that the wants of our farmers are not forgotten; *Atmospheric Engine and Railway*, *Astronomy*, *Barometer*, with a score of lesser

* But here is a blunder not easy to account for: the *Cloaca Maxima*, "the first arched monument on record, consisted of a small dome supported by a few pillars, under which stood the augurs; the object was to protect the priest against the sun and rain, and at the same time allow him to study the horizon and be seen by the people"! — p. 20.

articles, note for us the progress of the arts and sciences; while *Archery, Armor, Arms, Army, Artillery, Attack, Battalion, Battle*, with *Arbela, Armada, Austerlitz, Bannockburn, Balaklava*, etc., make this volume by itself a pretty full encyclopædia of military affairs. We give these as hints of the variety to be found under these two thousand titles, not at all by way of invidious distinction; and to show that the work, though not in every point everything that could be wished, is to a very extraordinary degree such a companion as the general reader needs and will value, quite as much as the literary man.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Longman & Co., of London, have lately published:—

The sixth volume of Merivale's "History of the Romans under the Empire," bringing the narrative down to the Destruction of Jerusalem;

Capgrove's Chronicle of England, and three Lives of Edward the Confessor, in old English, Norman-French, and Latin, with translations, fac-similes, &c.,—a beautiful addition to our antiquarian libraries;

A very full and entertaining biography of Cardinal Mezzafanti, prepared by the President of the Catholic College at Maynooth;

The fourth volume of Humboldt's Kosmos. Part I. Translated by General Sabine.

A Life of Shelley, in four volumes, by Thomas Jefferson Hogg (Moxon), two large octavo volumes of Indian Antiquities, by James Prinsep (Murray), and the second volume of Rawlinson's Herodotus, are among the more noteworthy recent productions of the English press. A notice of Gladstone's "Homer and the Homeric Age" will appear in our next number.

A literary curiosity is a volume of New Zealand Proverbs and Apologues, with a running interpretation, which bears the unfamiliar mark of the Cape Town press. At Little, Brown, & Co.'s.

The first number of the Stereographic Magazine (to be illustrated with stereographic illustrations) will be published in London, July 1.

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

THEOLOGY.

Evil not from God; or, The Mystery: being an Inquiry into the Origin of Evil. By John Young, LL. D., Edinburgh. New York: Mason Brothers. 12mo. pp. 343.

The New York Pulpit in the Revival of 1858. A Memorial Volume of Sermons. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 12mo. pp. 395. (Twenty-five Sermons, by as many preachers.)

Sermons of the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, of London. Fourth Series. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 12mo. pp. 445.

The Happy Home. By Kirwan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 16mo. pp. 206.

Glimpses of Jesus; or, Christ exalted in the Affections of his People. By

W. C. Balforn. From the Second London Edition. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 16mo. pp. 259.

The True Glory of Woman, as portrayed in the beautiful Life of the Virgin Mary, Mother of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By Rev. H. Harbaugh. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 12mo. pp. 263.

Select Discourses, by Adolphe Monod, Krummacher, Tholuck, and Julius Müller: translated from the French and German. By Rev. H. C. Fish and D. W. Poor. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 12mo. pp. 408.

An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. By W. M. L. De Wette. Translated from the Fifth, improved and enlarged Edition, by Frederick Frothingham. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 8vo. pp. 388.

The Character and Work of Christ. By William B. Hayden. Third Edition. Boston: Otis Clapp. 12mo. pp. 83. (Paper.)

Studies of Christianity: or, Timely Thoughts for Religious Thinkers. A Series of Papers by James Martineau. Edited by William R. Alger. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 12mo. pp. 494.

Portrait of a Christian, drawn from Life; a Memoir of Maria Elizabeth Clapp, by her Pastor, Chandler Robbins. Boston: Sunday-School Society. 16mo. pp. 134.

Plain Words to Young Men. By Augustus Woodbury. Concord: E. C. Eastman. 12mo. pp. 250.

Rays of Light. Second Series. Otis Clapp. 32mo. pp. 128.

Immersion not Baptism. By Rev. John H. Beckwith. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 24mo. pp. 47.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

History of Europe from the Fall of Napoleon in MDCCCXV. to the Accession of Louis Napoleon in MDCCCLII. By Sir Archibald Alison. Vol. III. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 449. (Closing with the disasters in Afghanistan, in 1842.)

History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States: with Notices of its Principal Framers. By George Ticknor Curtis. New York: Harper & Brothers. Vol. II. 8vo. pp. 653.

Wyoming: its History, Stirring Incidents, and Romantic Adventures. By George Peck. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 430.

Truth Stranger than Fiction. Father Henson's Story of his own Life. With an Introduction, by Mrs. H. B. Stowe. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 12mo. pp. 212.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Handy Book on Property Law; in a Series of Letters. By Lord St. Leonards. From the Fifth London Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp. 216.

The White Mountain Guide-Book. Concord: Edson C. Eastman. 12mo. pp. 152.

Hymns and Tunes for Vestry and Conference Meetings, by Edwin M. Stone. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 16mo. pp. 116.

A Practical Grammar of the Latin Language, with Perpetual Exercises in Speaking and Writing. For the use of Schools, Colleges, and Private Learners. By G. J. Adler. Boston: Sanborn, Carter, Bazin, & Co. 12mo. pp. 706.

Handbook of German Literature, with Critical Introductions and Explanatory Notes; to which is added an Appendix of Specimens of German Prose. By G. J. Adler. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp. 550. (Consisting chiefly of a few masterpieces of the German Drama.)

A Compendium of American Literature chronologically arranged, with Biographical Sketches of the Authors. By Charles D. Cleveland. Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle. 12mo. pp. 740.

The Reason Why: a careful Collection of many Hundreds of Reasons for Things which, though generally believed, are imperfectly understood. A Book of condensed Scientific Knowledge for the Million. New York: Dick & Fitzgerald. 12mo. pp. 346.

The Anniversary and Sunday School Music-Book. New York: Horace Waters. pp. 31.

The Golden Harp: a Collection of Hymns, Tunes, and Choruses, for the use of Sabbath Schools, Social Gatherings, Picnics, and the Home Circle. By L. O. Emerson. Boston: O. Ditson & Co. pp. 168.

PAMPHLETS.

Christian Citizenship and Honest Legislation. A Sermon delivered at the Annual Election, Wednesday, June 6, 1858. By F. D. Huntington, D. D. Boston: William White. pp. 44.

Truths for the Times. 1. The Reasonableness of Future Endless Punishment. 2. Instantaneous Conversion, and its Connection with Piety. 3. Justification and its Consequences. By Nehemiah Adams, D.D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. pp. 35.

The Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches. Presented March 21, 1858. Boston: John Wilson & Co. pp. 33.

Fifteenth Annual Report of the Managers of the State Lunatic Asylum. Transmitted to the Senate, February 7, 1858. Albany: C. Van Benthuyzen. pp. 61.

Letters to the Members of the American Tract Society, on the Tract Controversy. By the Boston Secretary. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. pp. 112.

The Young Men of America, considered in their several Responsible Relations. By Samuel Batchelder, Jr. New York: N. A. Calkins. pp. 32. (A Prize Essay.)

The Southern Platform; a Manual of Southern Sentiment on the Subject of Slavery. By Daniel R. Goodloe. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. pp. 96. (Double columns.)

Report of the Ministry at Large in Charlestown. April, 1858. By Rev. O. C. Everett. Charlestown: W. W. Wheldon. pp. 28.

The Reaction of a Revival upon Religion: a Sermon preached before the Convention of the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, May 27, 1858. By George E. Ellis. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. pp. 38.

The Doctrine of Endless Punishment for the Sins of this Life, Unchristian and Unreasonable. Two Discourses, delivered in Hollis Street Church, by T. S. King. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. pp. 66.

The Question of Priesthood and Clergy. By Compaginator. pp. 96.

Service, the End of Living. By Andrew L. Stone. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 48.

Remarks on Social Prayer-Meetings. By the late Bishop A. V. Griswold, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 99.

TO SUBSCRIBERS. — *Two or three Articles exceeding the limits appropriated to them, the Review of Current Literature in this number of the Examiner has been unavoidably abridged. Hereafter, as heretofore, the endeavor will be to give this department due space and prominence.*